

ISMAIL HAKKI BURSEVI'S

translation of and commentary on

FUSUS AL-HIKAM

by

MUHYIDDIN IBN 'ARABI



VOLUME 2

rendered into English by

BULENT RAUF

with the help of

R. BRASS and H. TOLLEMACHE

Foreword

God has extended this book of *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam* as a private Mercy to the people who want to reach perfection. As Ismail Hakki Bursevi's commentary says: 'Oh special people, Oh people of the *Fuṣūṣ*, this is a private Mercy from God which is extended to you, which leads the people of purity to perfection.' To value this is to give praise to God and to endeavour to treat the book as it should be treated, for it is a pure generosity. In approach to its meaning sentiment is essential, because there is no way of reaching to meanings and realities solely with the intellect since it is limited in its capacity and it fixes and categorizes truth by its very nature, and it could not therefore be the central instrument for understanding a book of this calibre and weight as it might conceivably be in the case of a purely academic or scholarly work. This book is beyond ordinary measure. It is beyond the general run of mystical writings, and it is more than just a book of meanings. It is to do with the very meaning of meanings, with the meanings, the realities and the knowledges of God, and it comes directly from God according to His own manner and wish. This matter is so elevated and of such grandeur and magnificence that one could not, however much one studied it or used different methods of approach, arrive at a real comprehension without God's help and assistance, and it would seem to be of primary importance to ask for that help and for the aptitude which is capable of receiving the meaning perfectly. It is His own Knowledge and there is no Knower but Him, and if such an aptitude or receptivity should become realized in us, it is because He gives it as a gift.

Since the *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam* does not result from conjecture, from speculation, from opinion, or from any partial aspect, and since it has arrived according to its own manner and according to the original purity and uniqueness, then it has necessarily been brought to the exterior in the only way it could be brought in order to fulfil these

requirements, and that is through total sainthood and servanthood whereby there is no interposing of the self (*nafs*) which colours and misrepresents the truth, because the saint is in Union and in Union there is the One Unique Self and no other. The words of the saint are to be trusted, and in fact it is made quite clear in the commentary in several places that denial of the words of the Shaykh Muhyiddin Ibn 'Arabi is the same as denial of the words of the Prophet Mohammed and the words of God.

Ibn 'Arabi is the Seal of the Mohammedian Sainthood, the most perfect heir to the Prophet Mohammed and revealer of his mysteries, and it is most eminently suitable that it should be he who exposes the wisdoms contained in the *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam*. The Prophet put the book into his hands in a veridic dream, saying: 'This is the book of the *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam*. Take it and bring it out to the people who will benefit by it.' It is in accordance with this very same order that the commentary of Ismail Hakki Bursevi has been written. As he says: '... and in accordance with the Envoy (S.A.) saying: "Bring it out to the people who will benefit by it", the words of the book were translated into Turkish and were commented upon for the benefit of the people and for the manifestation of the Knowledge of God . . .' Although there have been many commentaries on the *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam*, this one of Ismail Hakki Bursevi is of special importance and significance. First, he is a great saint, and in order for a commentary on the *Fuṣūṣ* to properly draw out and magnify the meanings intended by the Shaykh, in order for it to truthfully explain the knowledges and mysteries and realities and indications and allusions, sainthood and perfect servanthood is without a doubt the necessary prerequisite. But the point to be made particularly here is the following: Bursevi was a Jelveti Shaykh who lived from 1653 to 1725, and the Jelvetis emerged in the 16th century from the Helveti Order through the great Shaykh Mahmud Muhyiddin Uftade instructing his principal disciple Aziz Mahmud Hudayi Effendi in the manner which was to become that of the Jelveti Order, and Hudayi became the first Shaykh of that Order. Ibn 'Arabi did not found a *ṭarīqa* as such, but the Jelveti manner reflected most closely his teaching. The Helvetis are disposed towards retreat (*khalwa*) and seclusion with the Beloved through

retirement from this world, but the taste of the Jelveti is at the same time for the return to this world after Union, the coming out of that seclusion adorned with the Divine characteristics, which is regarded as progress, as an added gift (the bridal present – *jilwa*), the superlative perfection of expression, and this manner very clearly signifies that which is central to 'Arabi's teaching and the Mohammedian Way. It is therefore most appropriate and not at all surprising that a Jelveti Shaykh should have written the definitive commentary. It is interesting to note that the difference between the names Helveti and Jelveti is in the diacritical point, the added dot of the *jīm* of Jelveti.

All *ḥamd* to God forever for the *Fuṣūṣ* and for the fact that there should be a commentary such as this one which has now been translated into English. It is an exceptional gift to people that the realities and mysteries of the *Fuṣūṣ* should have been elucidated and enlarged and taken even further through one who knew not only all the other commentaries but who knew intimately and exactly 'Arabi's meaning, and in the case of several meanings being possible, which meaning the Shaykh preferred. He in fact discussed many points from the *Fuṣūṣ* with the Shaykh himself at his house in Damascus. It need hardly be said that such converse is possible despite the fact that there are centuries between them in the apparent world. In the Universe of *mithāl* the Prophet Mohammed instructed Bursevi and tested him on his knowledge of Arabic in the company of the great saints and prophets who were there present, in order to verify and make known to the company that he knew the language. This event in the Universe of *mithāl* is related in the commentary, and the following is a short extract: '. . . and I, taking that Quran from the hands of the Envoy (S.A.), opened it at a place and saw that it was the Envoy's own handwriting and began to read under the instruction and verification of the Envoy himself, and he, giving me lessons, blew into my heart the realities of the Quran and the delicacies of the *furqān* (discrimination), and I became so drowned in Divine Knowledge that whatever thing I was questioned upon, I gave answers.'

R. A. Brass
Oxford

1985

Contents

The Wisdom of the Transcended Magnificat in the Word of Noah	323
The Wisdom of Sanctity in the Word of Idris (Enoch)	395
The Wisdom of Ecstasy and Rapture in the Word of Abraham	437
The Wisdom of the Truth in the Word of Isaac	485
The Wisdom of Exaltedness in the Word of Ishmael	547

**The Wisdom of the Transcended Magnificat
(*al-ḥikmat as-subbūḥiyya*)
in the Word of Noah**

The Wisdom of God-being-Ever-Praised being apportioned to the Word of Noah its mystery was mentioned in the index. Now, only know that Seth was the place of manifestation of the Effusion of Compassion and the source of the gift of Names, and by virtue of the receptive *a'yān*, the Divine Names having effused their being, there necessarily appears in the Names and *a'yān* an increase together with this. The time between Seth and Noah being long and there being no prophet during that time, the people of Noah took the numerous Names as people and forms, and even the eschatology and the future states and the sciences of the Names of perfection and the Day of Resurrection to be absolutely bodily. Their state necessitated that they be invited to transcendence. Consequently, Noah was sent to them with the Wisdom of praise and the removal of comparison and similarity (*tashbīh*). But according to the Mohammedian taste, transcendence is the same as limitation. Therefore the Shaykh says: **Know that with the people of Reality, transcendence of the Divine Person is exactly the same as limitation and relativization and conditioning.** This is to say that you should know that with the people of veracity, transcendence of the Divine Person is the same as limitation and conditioning; because the transcendence of God is its differentiation from the things which transcend it from material bodily things and latter things; and to transcend a thing or to differentiate it from something is to differentiate it by qualifying it by another quality which differentiates that which is differentiated from what it was before. Consequently, He is re-qualified, re-conditioned and limited again. Or it may be that it is transcended from conditioning, then it is conditioned by absoluteness because for the absolute transcendence is a condition, whereas God is transcendent from both the conditions

of relativity and the absoluteness, and is not conditioned either by absoluteness or by relativization or conditioning. Now, understand that what is meant by the Divine Person is the Presence of Divinity which collects in itself the totality of the Divine Names and holds in annihilation the totality of all things, and in particular is circumscribed by virtue of the place of manifestation. Thus the Names of the things of the Divine Ipseity and things of the manifested Names and their necessities are all Divine qualifications, and there is not a thing in existence which is not the place of manifestation of a Name, and there is not an ion from among the ions of the universe which is not a conduit for the Divine effusion. He (God) says: 'God is the Light of the heavens and of earth.' In the places of manifestation of the higher spirits His Light is brilliant and His Light of beauty of Lordship extends over the lower beings. Thus, to transcend God from a thing is to limit Him by that thing's non-existence, and to singularize Him from the necessities of His Ipseity is to condition Him with absoluteness.

And the transcender is either ignorant or he is lacking in good form. Thus, the transcender is either ignorant or is impolite and lacks good form, because if somebody transcends God from something, that transcender either does not see the manifestation of God in that thing, is not in gnosis of that thing and is not a witness to that thing, or he is in gnosis but because he is under the determination of his own *nafs* he transcends God from that thing which is the conditions of the Divine Ipseity. Consequently, he is lacking in good form in two ways. One of the ways is this, that not having conformed to the regulation (rule) of the *haqq* he has deviated from it, and the other is this, that in spite of the words of the envoys, the qualification of the *haqq* having come about, he is in a way against God and the envoys.

Now let it be known like this, that in the Divine Presence transcendence is limitation and conditioning, but in the Presence of Uniqueness transcendence is proof of association (*shirk*) because the transcender cannot transcend God without proving something other than God, and in the Presence of Uniqueness there is nothing other than God. To prove the otherness of something at that level is complete association. Thus it necessitates transcendence, the transcender and

that which is transcended from, which is a necessary plurality, and these are all against oneness. That is why the Shaykh (R.A.) limited conditioning in the Divine Person. But if he transcends and speaks by it, that is to say, if the ignorant and the one who lacks good form and maintained his assertion, in other words, if they did not prove in one way the transcendence and in another way the immanence and similarity, but instead proved and maintained what they believed, they are qualified with ignorance and lack of form, because conditioning by absoluteness conditions and limits what they believe in. However, had they through cognosis transcended in one way and similarized and immanenced in another way, they would not be qualified with ignorance and lack of form, and they would be free of limiting and condition. And the believer who maintains through the law (*sharī'a*) the transcendence and remains with transcendence and does not see other than transcendence and remains there, he in fact is short of form and belies the Truth and the envoy. He is in error, and this is where he is lacking in form because with his own intelligence and thought he determines over God and encloses Him in the image that he has brought about according to his understanding, because transcending through the human intelligence, which is conditioned by thought, is conditioning by virtue of the determinations and effects of intelligences. Thus the Divine Person who transcends from the thoughts of the polluted human intelligences, to be transcended by intelligences and His being encompassed by that which is understood by those intelligences is lack of form.

Believing God and the envoys is according to two aspects. One aspect is this, that according to the language of the envoys there has been in one way transcendence and in another way immanencing. For instance: 'There is not anything like Him, and He is the Hearer and the Seer.' Thus, if transcending, then it is necessary to belie God and the envoys. The other aspect is this: in accordance with the words of the envoys there happens to be the qualification of God with the qualities of immanence in consideration of transcendence occurring in certain degrees, like in: 'God mocks at them, and God is the best of deceivers', and other qualities of immanence, and even though the Divine Presence is completely transcended from qualities that come

after, and pure of them, and completely clean from the qualities of immanence, yet in the Book God has manifested by them. Thus, what is necessary for the imitator believer of transcendence is only this, that he should transcend the Person of the Most Great God from transcending and immanencing Him with his own *nafs*, and that he qualify the *ḥaqq* in accordance with what came from the words of the envoys as qualification, with which qualifications the High God qualified His own *nafs*, whether they be qualifications of transcendence or qualifications of immanence, and that he abstain from immanencing Him according to his vision and intelligence so that he does not belie the envoys and is free of lack of form, because the High God both transcended and immanenced and collected together between transcendence and immanence in one verset (*āya*) or perhaps even in the middle of an *āya*. Thus like in the words: '*ka-mithlihi shay'un*' ('There is not anything like Him') wherein He did not see or find the beginning, the letter (*kāf*) of immanencing, superfluous like some other person would observe. Thus, there can be a similar to God which is transcendent and its similarity is denied, and this kind of transcendence is the same thing as immanencing, and what is meant by this immanencing is transcendence because if that which is like God is transcended, subsequently God becomes transcended, and the second half, immanencing, is very clear, but in closer attention it is the same as transcendence because He is the Hearer and the Seer which proves privatization of hearing and seeing for the *ḥaqq*, because in reality there is no hearer or seer other than the *ḥaqq*. Thus He is the Hearer with the hearing of each hearer, and He is the Seer with the sight of each seer. Consequently, in hearing and in seeing there is no one associated to or with God.

The determination of the verifying gnostic is opposed to the imitating believer because that gnostic, in accordance with the necessity of his knowledge, transcends God with a relationship when he transcends God from a quality, and he is not oblivious of the fact that there is the revealing and the manifestation of the *ḥaqq* in that quality, and when he immanences Him he again immanences Him with an immanence which is of the necessities of the Ipseity of the *ḥaqq*, but when the gnostic is in the manner of the tree of Moses, then both

transcendence and immanence refer back to God and he transcends His *nafs* with one relationship and immanences it with another relationship, considering that that which is made similar is the same as that which makes it similar.

The Shaykh in his sentence: 'And the believer who maintains through the law ...' qualified the consentor to the laws with 'believer', this because he wanted to avoid including those who spoke through consent but were not believers. The Jews and Christians and other people of religion who in their daily life act or speak in consentment of Mohammedian laws but are not believers, these are qualified with covering up (*kufr*) which is the strongest form of ignorance and lack of form.

To return to what the Shaykh says: And he (the transcender) is not aware and imagines that he is in the substance of the matter, but he has missed, elapsed, and he is like those who believe in some things and deny some things. This means that the one who transcends is not aware that he is faulty and belies God and belies the envoy and he imagines that he is at the result of the matter (in the substance of the matter) but he is in error and he resembles that person who believes some of the determinations and orders which have come through the word of the envoy, and denies some others. He is like that person who is a believer by consenting and speaking in accordance with the religious laws (*shari'a*) but is an unbeliever by denying that thing which is the cause of those determinations. Thus, he becomes a believer by proving the being in the particularization (*ta'ayyun*) of that particularization for God, and having covered up the aspect of God by the being of the particularization, which particularization comes from the Divine Lordship and results there, he becomes a coverer-up of the Truth. It is in fact known that when the languages of the Divine laws are spoken concerning the *haqq*, they do not necessarily speak of a thing in particular, but rather in accordance with what would be understood first by the generality, but for the particular people it is spoken for a special meaning which is understood from the aspects of that speech in whichever language it is posed. That is to say, in whichever language it is posed, from the position of that speech and what is understood from its aspect for a particular meaning and for

these particular people, what each of the envoys has spoken has a particular meaning in that language through which they were sent.

Now what is meant by 'generality' is that in general the people are believers, and what is meant by 'particular' people is an elite from among them, and what is meant by 'understood first' is what is grasped when the speech is heard, that is, the obvious meaning which is accepted without interpretation, whereas in reality, for the aspect of the elite, there is enclosed in there another meaning which is understood from the aspect of that speech, and that meaning is private to the elite, and what is derived from the apparent meaning of the speech is the same for the generality and the elite. 'God does not burden anyone except in accordance with his ability.' In accordance with this Quranic saying, God does not address each person according to the ability of their intellect, but rather He addresses the people in general in words where the apparent meaning is understandable for each in accordance with their ability, because God does not speak in the station of envoyship with a speech the understanding of which is particular to some people and not for the others so that the generality will not understand from what is said, but He rather speaks with a language which is clear to all, and each person takes from it according to their own ability. But the elite become singularized from the generality with the other meaning by virtue of the arrangement of that speech, and indications that it necessitates, so that the elite, each one according to his degree, understand it according to different aspects. They are also in different layers (degrees) of understanding, like in the *ḥadīth* where it says: 'The Quran came down in seven layers', and equally: 'There is not a being for whom it is not meant in an obvious manner, and interiorly. Each letter has its limit and each limit has its enlightenment.' Therefore, in each speech there are unlimited meanings by virtue of the unlimited degrees of people, but what is necessary is the understanding of the first meaning of that speech by virtue of the qualification of that language, and the other meanings become degreed above that by true understandings and clear indications. Thus the totality of the people are addressed with the totality of the meanings from the degree of Uniqueness, which is the Most Ancient station, in the general language to the last degrees of mankind.

Thus, in the language of the generality the words: '*Laysa ka-mithlihi shay'un*' are words of transcendence, and the words: '*wa huwa s-samī'u l-baṣīr*' are words of immanence. According to the grammar the position of the letter *kāf*, as we mentioned above, causes this phrase to mean: 'There is not anything like It or equal to It (*mithl*)' and this is total transcendence, and the rest of the phrase is exactly the same as immanencing, but the elite understand the immanencing from the transcendence and the transcending from the immanencing, because the word *mithl* together with the letter *kāf*, if understood in the apparent way would mean a thing similar to the similarity of the thing and this would prove similarity and would necessitate immanencing, and in the same way the 'Hearer and the Seer' denotes the understanding that He alone is the Hearer and the Seer, and this is transcending. Thus, what is necessary for those believers who consent and speak through the laws is to concord with the first meaning in general in the language of the envoy and to transcend Him in concordance with that where there happens to be transcendence, and where there is immanencing to immanence Him so that they are freed from lack of form and freed from belying the envoy, and indeed there is manifestation for the *ḥaqq* in all *khalq* (creation) and He is the apparent in everything that is understood or signified. That is to say, the *ḥaqq* is apparent by virtue of the place in each of the creatural places of manifestation and in everything mentally understandable. Thus, in every existent and spoken word and in every understood commentation He is apparent by virtue of the place, and addresses with particular address, but each people imbibes according to their own degree. The generality imbibes it from every creature and everything spoken, and the particular people take it from all creatures, all things spoken, all things understood and all things known; but the meanings are brought down to the generality according to the first immediate comprehension, and in the particular people it is brought down in every kind of understanding from whence the particular people understand it in many ways. And God mentioned that which consists of the case where meanings are prevalent over the totality of understandings because the *ḥaqq* encompasses all understanding, and the totality is what He intends in relationship to those who under-

stand, but with the condition that the words lead and guide with the totality of leads to all aspects of that which is understandable from the words in every possible aspect whether the sentence be posed in Arabic or any other language, whichever language that phrase is set in. Consequently, the manifestation in every creature and that which is understood is the *ḥaqq*, then address is equally that of the *ḥaqq*, and taking from it is also from the *ḥaqq* by virtue of the place and by virtue of the understanding of what is taken. Consequently, the person whose aptitude and inclination is most complete and most total, his receiving is also total. The person whose aptitude is weak understands according to the apparent understanding, and his understanding and taking from it is not objectionable, although limited. 'To His creation He gave everything and then guided.' Thus, each thing's guidance is in accordance with its desert, but the first and the most important and most thorough is that which is the most complete and total. God is apparent by virtue of place in each creation and each thing known and each thing understood, but He is not particularly contained only by appearing in that thing or in another understanding. Therefore, if a person transcends God in one aspect he is short of form and belies the envoy in that God is manifest in the totality of creation and He is the one that is manifest in all that is known, and if he does not witness God in every creation and in everything known, and transcends God from certain aspects, then he is short of form.

And He is the interior in all that is understood, except in the understanding of he who says the universe is His image and His *ḥuwiyya* and that (He) is the Name Manifest (*zāhir*). And He is the interior and the hidden in all that is understood, except that He is not the hidden in the understanding of that person who says that in fact the universe is the image and the *ḥuwiyya* of the *ḥaqq* and the universe is the Name Manifest of the *ḥaqq*, because that person's understanding is not limited and because he understands from God, with God, and nothing is hidden or interior from him. Thus he knows that the universe is the image and *ḥuwiyya* of the *ḥaqq* in consideration of the conditioning of the *ḥaqq* with the Name Manifest (*zāhir*), although not in consideration of the Ipseity of the *ḥaqq*; thus, considering that the *ḥaqq* is the same as the universe, that the universe

becomes the *ḥaqq*'s image and *huwiyya* and that the Name Manifest (*ẓāhir*) becomes the universe by being manifest from the aspect of the conditioning and the relativization of the *ḥaqq* and not through the consideration of Absolute Reality since He is the Reality of the Absolute Divinity while He is conditioned with all the conditions of the Names. Consequently, the universe is the *huwiyya* of God and becomes the same as the universe from the aspect of manifestation, because God is the First and the Last and the Manifest and the Hidden. Thus, when the *ḥaqq* is manifest and when the manifest is the universe, He is the Name Manifest. As He is indeed by meaning the spirit of that which has manifested, He is the Interior. Just as the *ḥaqq* is the spirit of the thing manifest from the aspect of meaning and its reality, He is conditioned by the condition of being hidden and interior. Consequently, the *ḥaqq* is also the Hidden and the Interior (*bāṭin*), and *bāṭin* is equally the *huwiyya* of the *ḥaqq*. Thus it is the *ḥaqq* which is conditioned by manifestation in the universe and by being interior and hidden in the meaning, and manifestation or hiddenness are the *huwiyya* of the *ḥaqq*. His relationship when He is manifested in the images of the universe is the same as the relationship of the planning and executive spirit to its image. His relationship when He is manifested in the images of the universe is the same as the relationship of the planning and executive spirit to its image which it plans and executes. That is to say, after having obviated that the *ḥaqq* is the *huwiyya* of the *ẓāhir* and the *bāṭin*, the relationship of His hiddenness and interiority to His manifestness is the same as the relationship of the spirit, which plans and executes, to the image. The images of the universe are the *ẓāhir* of the *ḥaqq*, but they are prolonged and assisted (*mustamidd*) from the *bāṭin* and are effused from it, and the *bāṭin* prolongs and assists them just as the planning and executing spirit prolongs and assists the image, and the *bāṭin* is helped and prolonged from the *bāṭin* of the *bāṭin*.

Now, the images of the universe are not particular to the images of bodies, but are rather perhaps from the degree of the First *ta'ayyun* wherein the Absolute Unknowable revealed itself together with the *nafs-i-raḥmānī* and first manifested itself therein, and when at last it reached the images of the universe of witnessing which are the

last degrees of the universes it became prevalent to all the images of the universe which are there. That is, in each of these degrees the manifestness of the degree is helped and prolonged by its interiority. For example, the First *ta'ayyun* is the manifestation of the Absolute Unknowable and is prolonged from it and helped by it. The Second *ta'ayyun* is, equally, the manifestation of the First *ta'ayyun* and is prolonged from it and helped by it, and itself equally prolongs and helps it (what comes before it). The other Divine *ta'ayyunāt* and the universes of creation are equally like this, where each *ta'ayyun* is manifest in relationship to the *ta'ayyun* before it, and each *ta'ayyun* in relationship to the *ta'ayyun* that follows it is *bāṭin* and is like its spirit. However, what the Shaykh (R.A.) mentions is that that which is understood by the generality is according to the first meaning, as derived from what he says, which is the images of the universe of witnessing, concerning which all people of different Ways are united in the observation that its images exist with the *ḥaqq*, the *bāṭin*. But the elite and the collectivity of complete people, who are above them, considering the manifestation of each degree and its interiority, observe that their manifestation is prolonged from the interiority until the First *ta'ayyun*, which is where all the degrees end up, is reached. Thus, the Presences of the Names and the Divine *ta'ayyunāt* and the revelations of *jamāl* and *jalāl* and the personifications of the *rahmān nafs*, and the universes of intellect and spirit and the *nafs*, and the natural and elemental images, and images of the *mithāl* and of *khayāl*, and in the same way the images of the *barzakh* and insects and jinn and hells, forever and twice ever, and the images of all the endless *ta'ayyunāt*, are the manifestations of God, and by virtue of the interiority the relationship to all these is like the relationship of the planning and executive spirit to the image. And it is taken at the limit of Man, for instance his interior and his exterior. That is to say, Man is interior and exterior in composition because he is composed of spirit and image, and by his image he is manifest, exterior, and by his spirit he is interior. Thus Man is limited by interior and exterior, and his exterior rests on his interior, and his interior is manifest by his exterior which manifests its predications, and all things limited are like this. And each thing limited is equally limited like Man,

because for a thing a complete limit results only by description or mention of its exterior and interior, but God is the outward and the interior of the manifest, and He is the interior and manifest of the interior. **And God is limited by all limits.** Thus God is limited by all limits, so that all things that are limited are limited with Him. Thus, if God were to be limited He could only be limited by the totality of limits because He is the exterior and interior of all images that are limited by the exterior and interior, and the image which is limited in that image by manifestation and interiority is His particularizations (*ta'ayyunāt*), but the images of the universe are not bound and cannot be contained or circumscribed, and equally the limit of each image from among the images of the universe cannot be known except to the limit of that which results from the image of each universe. Thus God becomes limited by the limits of the image of the universe, yet the images of the universe are not bound and cannot be comprised because the images of the possibilities are endless. and the limit of each image from among the images of the universe is to the limit of that which results from the images of each of the universes. Thus, as the totality of the images of the universe are ordered, God does not become limited by the limit of the images which are not ordered. Thus the limit of the *ḥaqq* remains unknowable except through the knowledge of the limit of all images, and that this should come about is impossible, and the limit of the *ḥaqq* is impossible. That is to say, to have the knowledge of the limit of every image is impossible. Consequently, it is impossible to know the limit of God because God is Self-revealed from all eternity forever, and the receptive *a'yān* are equally perpetual in receptivity and the images of the universe are eternally immanenced. Consequently, the universe cannot be limited by the limit which depends on the images which are not immanenced. Consequently, for God limit becomes an unknown except that it is not unknown from the knowledge of the gnostic who witnesses the One Being of the *ḥaqq* and who knows that the images of the universe are the images and the Being (*huwiyya*) of the *ḥaqq*, and that by virtue of the place in the manifestation it is creatural, and by virtue of the interiority it is that which is understood. This is so because it happens in the perfection and completion of release and

self-substitution and in the ultimate imprinting and being or becoming mutually in line and conformity, and in his place of witnessing the appearance of God in the creature and immanence but with the condition that it is in accordance with the place.

However, receiving is equally from God in consideration of the place, whether it manifests itself and addresses itself in the generality according to the (superficial or) first understanding or whether it manifests itself and addresses itself (in the elite) according to the total comprehension, and like this, at the level of this kind of imbiber, transcending is totally elevated because transcendence and immanencing can only happen at the level of establishing another thing than God. But in his (the '*ārif*'s) level there is nothing other than the Being of the *ḥaqq* by which he could either transcend from the *ḥaqq* or immanence the *ḥaqq*, exactly as the Shaykh mentioned above when he said it is for God to manifest in every creaturality, and when he said the universe is His image and *huwiyya*, and also when he said He is the Name Manifest (*zāhir*). In this way, when somebody transcends Him, indeed he conditions Him and limits Him, and he does not know Him. As has been said, the transcender is short of knowledge because he limits and conditions the unlimited God. Now, that immanencer is like that transcender, who if he immanenced the *ḥaqq* and did not transcend Him, that is to say, if he transcended Him in the immanence, in fact that immanencer limited and conditioned God and he did not know Him with the reality of knowledge because immanencing is equally the limiting and conditioning of the unlimited Absolute because the immanencer likened God to matter and confines Him, and the transcender transcends Him from matter, so each of the two conditions God with what he understands and limits Him with what he knows.

Now let it be known like this, that transcending is like immanencing in conditioning and limiting, rather perhaps transcending is higher in limiting than immanencing because the result of transcending is immanencing and the result of immanencing is transcending, and the Divine Knowledge is higher than what is known and understood by these, because the Reality of God the High requires non-confinement with absoluteness, and in the Divine Books which have descended

through the tongues of the envoys God the High gave news of His own Essence (*nafs*) with both transcendence (*tanzīh*) and immanence (*tashbīh*). Thus, to take it with one of these without the other is to turn away from God. He who unites in his knowledge between transcendence and immanence and qualifies Him with the two qualifications as a whole, because it is impossible to know this in detail as there can be no encompassing of the images in the universe, which means that if a person in his knowledge unites between transcendence and immanence and qualifies Him as a whole (in general) with the two qualities, since it is impossible to qualify Him with the two qualities in detail since one cannot encompass all the images in the universe, as immanence is the manifest and witnessing and plurality, and transcendence is interiority and the unknowable and oneness, then the verifying gnostic, in consideration of the reality of God's oneness by which God is Unique and he transcends Him from all His particularizations, and in consideration of God's manifesting and revelation and by virtue of the Name Manifest, in consideration again that the universe is the *huwiyya* of the *ḥaqq* and thus he immanences Him, he will unite between transcendence and immanence, and with the quality of plurality and manifestation which is the necessity of immanencing, and with the qualities of interiority and oneness which transcendence necessitates he will qualify Him as a whole. Equally, the one who believes in the determinations that arrive from God and subjects himself and emulates the law will qualify Him with immanence and transcendence as a whole because the images of the universe are infinite and not encompassable and it is impossible to qualify Him with the two qualities in detail. Then certainly that person knows Him as a whole and not in detail, that is to say, not in detail because it is not possible to particularize in one go that which is infinite. Yet the High God, without finality and end, from all time details and particularizes the images of the universe. As has been pointed out before this, if some of the verifiers qualify the *ḥaqq* with the qualities of transcendence and immanence, as these two qualities are the necessities of the Reality of God, like firstness and lastness and manifestation and interiority, since God accepts similarity and opposition, since the Reality of God encompasses the totality of the oppositions and

images and is prevalent over the totality of all visions and similarities, that man then is completed in knowledge like Abu Sa'id Kharraz, who, when asked: 'By what thing did you know God?', answered: 'By uniting Him between the opposites.' However, God qualified the *huwiyya* of His oneness with firstness and lastness and manifestation and interiority. Yet, with all this, these relationships are one in opposition to the other.

Like the one who knew himself in general rather than in detail. Nevertheless, he knew himself in general and did not know himself in detail. That is to say, if he knows that his *nafs* is the place of manifestation and the image of one pronoun from among the Divine Names, and that that Name is his spirit and interiority, and observes in his own *nafs* some of the perfections, completenesses, which are treasured in the treasuries of that Name, he knows his Lord as a whole and he understands its perfections but does not know his *nafs* in detail because his *nafs* is according to the Divine image and the image of the universe, and he cannot observe (witness) in his own *nafs* the variety of these images and their perfections in one go. Thus he cannot know the witnessing of his own *nafs* in detail. Consequently, in the same way, he cannot know his Lord in detail, and he qualifies God with the quality of manifestedness as a whole which is image and immanence, and qualifies Him with interiority as a whole which is spiritual and transcendent. And in this way the Prophet (S.A.) attached the knowledge of God to the knowledge of the *nafs* and said: 'He who knows his self certainly knows his Lord.' That is to say, as the knowledge of the *nafs* as a whole necessitates the knowledge of God as a whole, the Prophet attached the knowledge of God to the knowledge of self and said: 'He who knows his *nafs* thereby knows his Lord.' Consequently, he who knows his *nafs* as a whole knows his Lord as a whole, and he who knows his *nafs* in detail knows his Lord in detail, but he cannot know his *nafs* in detail except through the aspect of his release from all conditions of manifestation and from the particularizations of the interiority, and only when the determinations of necessarily-so-ness and of possibilities are concordant in him. However, the knowledge of the *nafs* as a whole does not necessitate the knowledge of God in detail because knowledge of Reality which

is established for God does not occur except by uniting between knowledge of the Divine signs which are scattered among the images of the horizons and of detailing, and the uniqueness of the totality of the signs of the uniqueness of the totality in the images of Man. It is because of this that the High God pointed at this meaning and said: **'Soon We shall show them Our signs in the horizons' and that is that which is outside of you, and whose particularization in relationship to your particularization is a latter and different particularization, and the *ḥaqq* is manifested in each particularization with one revelation and He has covered in all particularizations with a discriminated and detailed covering. 'And equally We will show them in themselves' and that is the same as you, which is that the covered extended over the throne of the heart of the believer with a total complete and quranic covering, so that it is clear to those who are viewers who are looking at it. That is as if to say that that which is seen in the horizons and the persons is the *ḥaqq*, until it is clear without doubt for those who look at the horizons and the *anfus* that that which is seen in the horizons and the *anfus* is the *ḥaqq*. Due to the fact that you are His image and He is your spirit, and that you are to Him as a bodily image and He is to you as the executive spirit to the image of your body. That is to say, since you are His image and He is your spirit, and then you are for Him like a bodily image and He is for you like the executive spirit to the image of your body, which means that the fact that the *ḥaqq* is seen in the horizons and in the *anfus* is due to the fact that you are the image of the *ḥaqq* and to the fact that the *ḥaqq* is your spirit. Therefore the image of your body is like the executive spirit. That is to say, the manifesting of the *ḥaqq* in the places of manifestation of the horizon and the *anfus* is like the coming into presence of the horizons and the *anfus* by it and the manifestation of the spirit in the body and coming into presence of the body with the spirit, consequently the *ḥaqq* is your *huwiyya* and you are His image. In the same way, the *ḥaqq* is the Total Spirit, and spirit is the spirit of the universe, because the Ipseity with the reality of His Qualities is the executive total, and this limit applies to and prevails over both your manifestedness and your interiority. For instance, if you were to be described as the speaking animal this limit**

would apply to and prevail over your manifestedness, which is your body, by calling it an animal, because the body is named and is sensitive and mobile by will, and would apply to and be prevalent over your interiority, which is your spirit, by calling it the speaking, because spirit is the speaking *nafs*. Thus, that the *ḥaqq* is spirit to you is prevalent over all your being which is composed of spirituality and corporeality which are the manifest and the interior. That is to say, He is like the spirit to your image which is comprised of your interior and your manifestedness, and His disappearance from the image of the universe is not possible, and when the image is left behind when the executive spirit leaves it, man cannot be called a man but it can be said that this image resembles the image of a man and there is no difference between that and the image of a man of wood or stone, and the name 'man' applies to it only by extension, not in reality. The universe consists of the totality of the images of possessions and angelic spirits. Thus the universe is by itself non-existent. It only exists with the revelation of the *ḥaqq*. Yet the being of the universe combines between two revelations, and in each instant the *ḥaqq* reveals Itself to the universe with a new revelation and that revelation concentrates back into its origin, and reveals Itself with another revelation, thus the universe at every instant is both non-existent and existent, and its existence combines between the arriving revelation and the departing revelation. Consequently, the non-presence of the *ḥaqq* in the image of the universe is impossible, by which is meant that since the universe is the universe and is existent by the revelation of the *ḥaqq* and since the image of the universe is existent the revelation of the universe cannot be removed from it, which means that the existence of the image of the universe cannot be imagined at the level of God's absence from it because the existence of the image of the universe is in the combination of the two revelations. Consequently, since the image of the universe is in every instant non-existent and existent, from whence could one establish anteriority for the image of the universe, whereas that which enters into the realm of being is never non-existent and the other worldly images are existent and remaining in the combination of the two revelations? 'Everything is annihilated except His face.' It is according to this determination that

the thing existing, combining the two revelations under that determination for which there has been necessitated a witnessed revelation and the determinations of the Name Manifest, if it passes away that thing's manifest image passes away and is dissipated (*fānī*), and its interior image which is particularized in it by the universal revelation is its spirituality, and it cannot pass from the image of the universe by virtue of its interiority. That which is particularized in it of the Divine aspects is the Divine face. The human image which remains by the spirit, if the executive spirit were to leave it that image does not remain as man but one says concerning that image that it is an image which resembles the image of man. Thus, between that human image which is spiritless and a human image made of wood or stone there is no difference, and that image is not called 'man' except by extension and not in reality, and the fact that the *ḥaqq* is like the spirit to the human image is that the human image is composed of the spirit and the body. The spiritless human image is not really a human image, just as in the human limit the apparent image and the interior *huwiyya* are taken together, and the appearance of the human cannot be taken away from its interior and its interior cannot leave its exterior. That is why the Shaykh says: The cessation of the *ḥaqq* is absolutely impossible from the image of the universe because if God abstained from the universe by revelation the image of the universe would be non-existent, therefore, it could not have been called the image of the universe. Consequently, the image of the universe remains through the Being of the *ḥaqq* which is like the spirit to it, and it would pass away if God ceased to reveal Himself. And indeed the limit of Divinity for Him is by its reality, not figuratively, which means that just as in the limit of the human the manifest and the interior are taken together and that the manifest cannot pass away from the interior, in the same way, God, being the spirit of the image of the universe, does not pass away as Divinity from the image of the universe. Therefore, the limit of the Divinity is established in reality for the *ḥaqq* and not figuratively, because the presence of the divinified is by the Divinity. Consequently, since the divinified is present by the qualification of the Divinity of the Divine, the Divinity does not cease to be limited (circumscribed. defined) by the limit

of Divinity. Rather, considering that the *ḥaqq* is the *ḥuwiyya* of the universe, that the image of the universe is circumscribed by the limit of the apparent and the interior is the same as the circumscription of the *ḥaqq* by that limit. Yet at the level of God's abstention from the revelation of the image of the universe or at the level of the manifestation of the revelation of the Ipseity in accordance with 'Everything is annihilated except His face', at the level of the annihilation of all the images of the manifested discrimination of persons and the particularizations of the quranic *a'yān* of the interior, the Ipseity of the *ḥaqq* is Rich beyond Need of being qualified with Divinity because His Essential Uniqueness is Rich beyond Need from relationships of plurality. Divinity is the degree of the particularizations of the Divine Names at the degree of oneness by virtue of the receptivities of the unknowable *a'yān*. The revelation of being of the One is particularized by the Names, and the Names are manifest in the receptive *a'yān*, and the images which are manifested in the *a'yān* are the images of the universe. Consequently, the images of the universe which are manifest are present by the Names which are their interior. If it were imagined that there was a non-existence of the universe or that there was a cessation of the *ḥaqq* from it and it became non-existent, the Divine Names would not be particularized without places of manifestation, and determinations would not have manifested with revelations, and Divinity would not have been particularized. Thus Divinity in manifestation is in reality dependent upon the universe. Just as it is the limit of the man if he were alive. If the man is alive the limit of the man is verified in reality. That is to say, one would take his exterior and interior as his limit, and as his exterior is never removed from his interior, in the same way Divinity is never removed from the universe because the worshipped cannot be removed from the worshipper just as the cause cannot be removed from that which is caused. And also as in fact the manifest image of Man lauds with its tongue to his spirit and his *nafs* which organizes him, because his life and his remaining and his humanity is through that. In fact, it is by means of that that he can acquire Divine perfections and completions, and the arrival for him of the Divine bounties is by that, and the fact that he is the place of manifestation of the Divine image of

the uniqueness of totality is all through that. It is thus that God brought into the universe the image, and that is the image of the totality of all the images of possession and angelic spirits, which continuously gives praise and gratitude, and like that the High God caused the image of the universe, which is no other than the manifestedness and *huwiyya* of God which is no other than the images of possession and the collectivity of angelic spirits, to give constant praise and laudation of the *ḥaqq*. This means that He made it laudatory to His own *nafs* because the presence of the image of the universe is through God. Thus, the image of the universe, which is the combination of the manifest and the interior, is extended from its interior and is present with God who is its spirit, and is laudatory to Him and is in constant praise of Him. But we do not understand their constant praise because we cannot encompass what there is of images in the universe. Because we are conditioned by our sensorial existence and our possibilities we cannot understand the constant praise of all the images because we cannot encompass what there is of images in the universe because the images of the universe are different varieties and genres and the image of each genus understands only the constant praise of his own kind and does not understand the language of the genus which is outside his own genus. Thus, the images of the universe, in consideration of transcending from any lack His Names and Spirit, sing His praise (*sabḥ*), but in consideration of the manifesting of the perfections which are manifested from these images they give grateful praise (*ḥamd*). All the languages of God are eloquent with the praise of God. Thus, all the images of the universe are the languages of God and are eloquent with the praise to God. In other words, all the images are the manifestation of God, and in consideration of manifestation God is particularized in them and speaks with their language. Thus they are the languages of God and the languages of God are eloquent with the praise of the interiority and give gratitude to Him, and thus they said: 'Praise and gratitude to the Lord of the universes' (*al-ḥamdu lillāhi rabbi-l 'ālamīn*). That is, since all the images of the universe are God's languages, they said: 'Praise and gratitude to the Lord of the universes' which means that praise and gratitude is particular to God who is the Lord of the

universes. As the consequence of praise returns to God, and He is both the praise-giver and the one praised. In other words, in consideration of the meaning of *ḥamd*, the *ḥāmid*, the result of the praise-singing of all the images of the universe returns to God because that which is particularized in the images of the universe and is praise-giver is He, and in consideration of the meaning of the *ḥamd maḥmūd* in relationship of the interiority of the *ḥaqq*, the result of the totality of the praise-singing of the images of the universe belongs to Him because He is the spirit of the totality of the images. Thus, the *ḥaqq* with His exteriority is lauded and the act of praise and gratitude-giving is particular to Him, and with His interiority He is the one that is lauded and the state of having received praise and gratitude is particular to Him, and in this way He is the praise and gratitude-giver in detail, and collectively He is the praised and receiver of gratitude, and the Mohammedian perfection is this, that praise and gratitude, giving praise and gratitude or receiving praise and gratitude are all one thing and this station is the station of the receiver of praise and gratitude (*maqām-i-maḥmūd*).

**If you speak with transcendence you condition God,
And if you speak with immanence you will have limited
Him.**

Thus, if you speak of Him only with transcendence without immanence you will condition Him because to transcend God from the world is conditioning Him by taking Him out of the world, and if you speak with immanence, that is, if your belief is through the way of immanence without transcending Him, you will be limiting God because immanencing is limiting.

**And if you speak with the two orders you will be
rightly directed
And you will be a leader in cognosis, masterful.**

Thus, if you speak with the two orders, having joined between the transcendence and immanence with immanence in the manifest and transcendence in the interior, and if you speak with immanence in transcendence and transcendence in immanence, you will be properly

led in the degrees of the order, and in cognosis you will be a leader and a master which means you will be deserving of a following and you will be deserving of masterliness and caliphate.

**He who speaks with twoness has become an establisher
of a partner (*musharrik*),
And he who speaks with singularizing has become a
unifier.**

That is to say, if a person speaks with duality on this matter, that is, proves the immanence through the Being of the *ḥaqq*, his observation will be in duality and duality proves a partnership to God because he observes in being the *ḥaqq* and *khalq* and transcends God from the immanence. But if somebody speaks by singularizing Him he becomes a unifier because he has singularized God from duality and plurality by transcending Him from plurality. Thus he renders God one and conditions Him by oneness, and as he does not cognize Him he falls into polytheism (*shirk*) because he proves something other than the *ḥaqq* from which he transcends the *ḥaqq*, whereas singularity is the correlative of number, like being a couple. Thus the immanencer compares the One Existent to other existents, therefore he associates them in their being, and the transcender takes one of the beings out of the other and distinguishes Him after having associated Him in being. Thus he also takes God out of being from the number of duality and he becomes like the one who says: 'God is the third one of the Trinity.' Note that the word 'speaks' which occurs in the stanzas has been taken by some to mean formulation or avowal or informing. That is why the Shaykh made the verb transitive by the use of the letter *bā'*.

**Beware of immanencing Him or you will make Him a
double,
And beware of transcending or you will be one who
singularizes.**

if you make a second of the Real One God so as to prove immanence by it, beware. There are two ways of proving secondity. One way is that both existents are ancient and this is the word of the polytheist,

and the second way is this, that the first of these is necessary and ancient and the second one is latter, effusing from the necessary, so that it is not possible for the one to be the same in any aspect as the other, and these are the words of the manifest believers and the words of the veiled wise ones. Note that in certain copies it has happened as *thābitan* with a *tā'*, instead of *thāniyan*, which would mean: beware of immanencing Him if you are proving another by (using) God. That is to say, if you are trying to prove immanence by (using) God by saying that *khalq* is other than the *ḥaqq*, do not try to prove that, and do not immanence. Rather, observe God as the same as the immanence as He is manifested in the images of conditioning, and observe Him as immanence through manifestation and absolute transcendence through interiority, and equally avoid transcending if you are singularizing Him. That is to say, if you are singularizing Him from duality, do not transcend Him from number because there is nothing other than Him from which to transcend Him when He is one with His Ipseity and many with His Qualities. Consequently, oneness, plurality, absoluteness and relativity are all essential relationships. God cannot be transcended from His own Being and from His necessarily-so-nesses. Therefore, if you transcend Him you will be proving another from which you transcend Him, whereby you relativize Him and condition Him. Consequently, it means that if you are going to speak with the singularity of the Being of the *ḥaqq*, beware of transcending Him because if there is not anything other than God, God cannot be transcended from His Ipseity and His Necessarily-so-ness.

You are not Him, yet you are Him, and you see Him therein

The same as the orders, boundless and conditioned.

The conditioned one who is addressed with conditioning, you, is an allusion to the conditioned Essence of the *ḥaqq* which is particularized in the witness, which is again you, and the one who is conditioned with the condition of unknowableness, which is He, is an allusion to the absolute *huwiyya* and *lā ta'ayyun* and *ghayb* of the *ḥaqq*. Thus, conditioning eradicates the singularization of the *ḥaqq*, who is addressed with conditioning and which is you, from His

unknowableness and absoluteness which is He. That is to say, the conditioned being, as it is conditioned, cannot be the same as the absolute being, as that is absolute. Perhaps rather you are He, that is to say, in consideration of the Reality of being the conditional is absolute which is conditioned in the conditional and absolute in the absolute. Consequently, the meaning becomes as follows, that while you are conditioned by the condition of manifestation you are not the same as the Being of God which is absolute and unknowable, but considering the Reality of being you are the same as Him and His *huwiyya*, and you see Him in the essence of orders in His absoluteness because in the images of the totality He is total, that is to say, with one reality. In the *'ayn* of the *a'yān* you see Him as conditioned by each *'ayn* by virtue of His manifesting by an *'ayn*, because one conditioned thing is different to another conditioned thing but the same in the absolute. Conditioned is the Name Manifest (*ẓāhir*) and the universe, and the absolute is the Name Interior and God, and this aspect is what emanates as the apparent aspect from the Shaykh's words.

In the words: '. . . and you see Him therein' the word *fī* can be equally read with the pronounced *yā'* with emphasis, which would make the whole meaning come to as follows: you are not Him, that is, the conditioned is not absolute in consideration of the difference between relativity and absoluteness. Rather, you are the same as Him considering the Reality of being. Thus 'and you see Him therein', because you see Him in the Reality of the Mohammedian isthmuseity which collects together the manifest and the interior, and which is conditioned by the manifest and the universe, and the *ḥaqq* and the absolute by interior, and by virtue of My particularization in that Reality thereby you see in Me the same thing as the orders, by virtue of the interior as absolute and the *ḥaqq*, and by virtue of the exterior as conditioned and the *khalq*.

Now, the pronouns 'you' and 'Him' and the letter *kāf* of address and the letter *tā'* of address and the pronounced *yā'*, all these allude to One *'ayn* which manifested at the degrees of manifestedness and interiority, because the reality which is particularized in the 'you' is the same as the reality which is particularized in the 'He', and in

the same way, by virtue of the *khalq* being creation it is other than God when *ḥaqq* is considered as *ḥaqq*. Equally, the manifest when it is considered as manifest is not the same as the interior, but the Reality of God, which is One *ʿayn*, considered in the degrees of manifestation and revealing in revelations and particularizations with manifestation and interiority, is First and Interior and Manifest and Latter, and is absolute in the absolute and relative in the relative, and He is transcended with absoluteness and immanenced with relativity. God said: 'There is not the same as Him a thing, and He is the Hearer and the Seer.' God immanenced and dualized by saying: 'There is not the same as Him a thing.' Thus, if the added-on *kāf* is considered according to Arabic grammar the meaning becomes transcended over the generality, and when He said: 'He is the Hearer and the Seer' He immanenced because creation is equally hearer and seer. If one considers the added-on *kāf* as not added on, then the meaning becomes particular for the *ḥaqq*, but thus He has then immanenced and dualized because in this case it comes to mean: 'There is not another similar thing like It.' Thus He proves similarity from which He discards the dual similarity of things. Thus dualizing and immanencing becomes necessary.

'And He is the Hearer and the Seer', thus He transcended and singularized, which means that He said He is the Hearer and the Seer, thus (after) having transcended He singularized, and even though hearing and seeing is for everybody it is in the unity of God, because precedence of the pronoun and the explanation which follows in the saying expresses confining. That is to say, that which is hearer and seer in every hearer and seer is God, and there is no hearer or seer other than Him. Thus, transcending from similarity He singularized, thus He immanenced in the transcendence and He transcended in the immanence, because immanencing and transcending are each essential for the Reality of God and God is in the total of all these.

Now the Shaykh, having left behind the conditions of the transcender and the immanencer, refers to the condition of the people of Noah at the time of his invitation.

If Noah had collected between the two invitations for his people, of course they would have followed him. The people of Noah, hav-

ing gone into excess in immanencing, were veiled from the unity of God by the plurality of Names. Noah, exaggerating in transcendence, invited them away from the idolatry of the Names to the unity of the Essence and to pure exclusive unity. Thus his people did not follow him because they were veiled from unity by the witnessing of plurality, but if Noah had combined between the two invitations, that is to say, between the oneness of the Ipseity and the plurality of the Names, and had invited them with immanencing in transcendence and transcending in immanence like Mohammed invited, surely they would have followed him. But the state of their depth in plurality and manifestation and the manifest was such that it necessitated destruction from the Divine Energy. That is why they were invited with the invitation of transcendence which was far from their inclination and understanding.

And he invited them openly (publicly and directly), that is to say, he invited them to the unity which is destructive of the plurality of Names which are under the Name Manifest (*ẓāhir*). Thus they with their manifestations did not follow him, the predications of plurality having preponderance over them, but they followed him by acting with the *ẓāhir* and followed him in God's detailed and discriminatory Book and to the outward form of the Name Manifest because the universe is the versified image of the Divine Word with which God spoke exactly in the Breath of the *raḥmān*. Thus they only heard the meanings of the places of manifestation which are present in the manifestations of the veiling of the words and they followed that, but they were deaf of hearing the One God. Thus they covered up the aspect of the uniqueness with *kufr* (covering up) of plurality.

Then he invited them to the mystery. After that he invited them to the mystery, that is to say, to the Name Interior (*bāṭin*). That is, he invited them to the uniqueness which destroys the plurality of the Names which are under it (*bāṭin*), so that their interior would be conditioned to the oneness of the Ipseity, but although he invited them to the mystery of the interior they were all in the manifest, and the determinations of the darkness of particularizations having spread over them they were busy with the apparent plurality and had gone far into it and were distanced from the oneness of the interior. Thus

Noah's invitation had no effect on them and they became deniers of Noah and manifested the repudiation of his invitation and they insisted on tormenting him. Then he said to them: Ask of your Lord that He pardon you. That is to say, ask for His pardon so that He covers you, protects you from these particularizations of veils and the veils of darkness with the Light of His Being, and that you become led to the oneness of God. Indeed He pardons abundantly. In fact, your Lord does pardon abundantly because His pardon is established superlatively and absolutely in the case of those who ask for His abundant pardoning. Thus, Noah having invited them directly and through the mysteries of the interior, they became bewildered and did not concord with the discriminatory invitation. Consequently, Noah complained to his Lord of their non-concordance with his invitation and he said: Lord, I invited my people by night, to the interior, and by day, to the manifest. My invitation did not increase in them anything other than running away. And Noah (S.A.) said: 'Oh Lord, indeed I invited my people by night to the interior, and by day to the manifest, and I did not stop inviting them night and day. Thus my invitation to them did not increase in them anything other than running away.' And the fact that Noah's invitation caused in them an increase in running away from the Truth was because his invitation did not happen to be between the two invitations and because of the fact that they were far from unity due to their lack of inclination.

And Noah mentioned concerning his people that they made themselves deaf to his invitation. The people of Noah made themselves deaf to the invitation of Noah, and he said: And in fact whenever I invited them so that You pardon them, they brought their fingers to their ears, because they understood the mystery of that which was not in concordance to their religion and their state in asking for pardon when I said to them: 'Ask of your Lord that He pardon you', because the determinations of the plurality of veiling were predominant over them. Because it was known to them what would be necessary for them if they concorded with his invitation. That is to say, they deafened themselves to Noah's invitation at the level of hearing this invitation because they knew what was necessary for them in following Noah's invitation. That is to say, they knew that to concord

with Noah's invitation was necessary for them. And they prided themselves in their *nafs* and covered themselves with their clothes and said: 'We shall not support your Divinity.' Thus, with their clothes they hid themselves so as not to hear his invitation.

Gnostics of God know to what Noah points concerning his people, lauding them with the tongue of disparagement. Thus, the gnostics of God who verify, knew what Noah (S.A.) intended to point at by lauding over them with the tongue of disparagement concerning his people. That is to say, they knew from the fact that they agreed to Noah's invitation in the form of opposition and that they concorded in the form of denial, and that what Noah (S.A.) was pointing at was lauding when he pointed at that lauding with the tongue of disparagement in lauding his people, because Noah (S.A.) had invited them to ask for pardon, that is to say, to cover themselves with pardon. Thus, by completely covering themselves they became manifest with the revelation of the One and All-Destroyer. Thus, the people of Noah having affirmed him in the image of denial, Noah equally lauded them in the image of disparagement with the words: 'Lord, do not support on earth a land of coverers of Truth (*kāfirīn*)', which means that he prayed for them so that they reach the interior and the collecting together. In fact they accepted his invitation in the image of deviating from it. Thus they became manifest in the image of ignorance when in fact they had knowledge of arriving to the invitation. And they knew, (and in certain copies:) and they know, that they did not accede to his invitation because of what there was of discrimination in it. The words 'and they know' refer to the gnostics of God, and the gnostics of God knew that Noah's people did not accede to his invitation because there was discrimination in it, because Noah invited his people from plurality to oneness and from immanence to transcendence and this invitation is exactly discrimination. It is an invitation from one degree to another degree. In the first degree with the lack of witnessing the *ḥaqq* and invitation to the absolute is discrimination. It is like from the Name Disparager to the Name Endearer, and from the Name Misleader to the Name Guide, different to the invitation of Mohammed (S.A.): 'I invite to God and to *baṣīra* (vision), myself and those who follow me, and glory and praise

to God and we are not of those who associate.' His invitation is according to discrimination according to vision. Thus Noah invited them by virtue of their intellect sometimes by night, and by virtue of their images, by day. Consequently, as there was discrimination in his invitation they did not accede to it.

The order is conjunctive (*qur'ān*) not of discrimination (*furqān*). The order of being is conjunction (*qur'ān*) and not discrimination, which means that the Essential Reality of Uniqueness is collective of the totality of the Divine Names and contains the apparent and inclinational realities and there is nothing outside of His Essential comprehension. Thus the oneness of the Ipseity and the plurality of the Names are the necessities of the Ipseity of Uniqueness. Consequently, transcendence and immanence, singularization and differentiation, are among the relationships of opposition and it is not through the consideration of the Ipseity of Uniqueness which collects in Itself the relationships of differentiation and the qualities of otherness. Therefore, as the Uniqueness of Ipseity shows Itself by virtue of the place as the plurality of relationships of Names or as the plurality of possibility of beings, It cannot be transcended from any thing because a thing cannot be transcended from its own essence and particularities of its own ipseity. Consequently, the order is conjunction and not discrimination. The Shaykh points out that the people of Noah were in conjunction. That is why they inclined to one side from discrimination and did not accede to the invitation.

The Shaykh (R.A.) goes into the explanation of the relationship which exists between the two stations and to the state of the person who descends in each station from the two stations. And he who is present in conjunction does not incline to discrimination because in fact he is in it (the conjunction). That is to say, if a person dwells at the degree of conjunction (*qur'ān*) and collectivity, he would not incline to the information which appertains to discrimination because he is in the centre of conjunction and does not know what difference is, although, all the same, discrimination is within the conjunction and is not outside of it, and the inclination to discrimination is within the conjunction because indeed the conjunction (*qur'ān*) comprises the discrimination (*furqān*). In other words, all the degrees of detailing

and discrimination are collected together in the collective totality and collective differentiation and conjunction. In other words, *qur'ān* collects all, but discrimination does not comprise the conjunction, that is, the discriminating collectivity, because in all the essences which are collected in the conjunction the manifestation by virtue of place in each is discriminatory and manifestation is not collective and conjunctive. That is why the discrimination does not comprise the conjunction and the person who dwells in the conjunction does not incline to discrimination. And thus (as to mean because the immanence is a conjunctive order) there has not been anybody except Mohammed (S.A.) who has been specialized with conjunction (*qur'ān*), and thus it is that his people are the best of people that have come out from among mankind. This means that as the order was not conjunction (before this) no one other than Mohammed (S.A.) was specialized with it. He was specialized with it because he was manifest with the necessities of the totality of the Divine Names and their realities, together with the collectivity of the conjunctivity of the totality of all the realities of the Divine Names, rather perhaps because his reality was the reality of the totality of the collectivity of the conjunctivity, and no other than the people of Mohammed (were given this specialization), that is to say, they also are specialized with conjunctivity because of their Mohammedian closeness and Ahmedian inheritance, because before this it so happened that all the perfect servants of God were the places of manifestation of the determinations which come down from the detailing Names. Thus, among the people of the past the necessary Divine determination was to invite to transcendence because these people were inclined to the plurality of idols and were harnessed to the invitation of the veils of the images of Names and were removed totally from the Reality of the Uniqueness which is the origin of plurality. However, the presence of idols and the worship of the images of the bodies of the universe came about because the manifestation of the relationships of the Unknowable which were essentially annihilated in the Essence of the Singularity and the particularization of the revelations in the First Will was the aim of God in that willing. Consequently, the realities first became manifest in the universe of witnessing because God intended that it

should be followed up and the perfection of gnosis does not come about except when each of the essential relationships becomes manifest in the image of totality in the universe of possession and witnessing with all their necessities and accidents with that kind of an image of manifestation in which are differentiated the particularities of the personalities, and that these particularities should not be in the image of the manifestability of the universe of order and of *malakūt* so that they are receptive of the revelations of the discriminations of the images of the Names, so at the beginning of order they aspected the manifested *mashī'a*. Consequently, when the idolatry of the veils of Names became manifest and the five Presences showed the revelations which were at the level of the five Presences, and when the *nafs* of everyone of that first era turned to the worship of the images of the Names according to the conditions of the flourishing of the first revelation and they were under the domination of the witnessing of the plurality of uniqueness, then it was necessary for them in relationship to them that the invitation to the collective and total completion and perfection be according to transcendence and unification. So much so, that parts of this spiritual transcendental invitation became completed only when the time of Jesus (S.A.) arrived. After that nothing remained but the invitation which is the special degree of collectivity. Consequently, the Mohammedian order of determination and wisdom became, as it is, totalizing, and his religious legal determinations also became totalizing businesses of the totality of perfections which are in some cases appertaining to their spirits and in other cases to their bodies and forms, and his religious law included all the religious laws previous to it and became manifest more abundantly. Consequently, the Mohammedian wisdom is totalizing between transcendence in the essence of immanencing and immanencing in the essence of transcending.

And there is not a thing like It, and it collected the order into one order. Thus Mohammed (S.A.) said: 'There is not a thing like It', thus he collected the order of immanencing and transcending in one order, that is, in one verse or even only in a part of the verse he collected it, and established the singularizing in the totality and the totality in the singularization, and he determined that plural is by its

qualification one and that one in reality is plural. It is because of this that he said: 'I was given the *jawāmi' al-kalim.*' However, the person of discrimination, his order is difficult and his invitation is even harder, because if he invites them to transcendence and unity and, as above-mentioned, to collectivity, his people will say to him: 'We will accede to your invitation according to these words: "There is not one from among the creatures whom He does not hold by his forelock because my Lord is according to the straight path."' Thus, the difference between the Guide and the Misleader and the Obeyer and the Rebel is removed, rather perhaps that in this kind of witnessing there is not even the existence of the rebel. On the other hand, if he invites them to immanence and detailing his people will obey him like the people of Moses who said: 'Show us God visually' and also: 'Bring us God and with Him His wife.' This is because the inviter is in one area and the invited is in another area and each one of them prefers their own surroundings, but the one who has collected between collectivity and detailing and immanencing and transcendence is different to all this.

If Noah had given a similar verse to this by word of mouth they would have acceded to it. Thus, if Noah (S.A.) had by word of mouth brought to his people a verse similar to this and if his invitation had been collective, his people would have acceded to it, just as Mohammed (S.A.) came with this sentence and his people acceded to it. That is why the Shaykh referred to it as 'by word of mouth' because Noah did come with a verse similar to this in meaning. That is why his people followed him with action, which following is spiritual, which following is more secret than following by word.

And that he immanenced and transcended in one verset, perhaps even in half a verset, because in fact Mohammed (S.A.) did immanence and transcend in one sentence, perhaps rather in half a sentence did he immanence in transcendence and transcend in immanence and collected between transcendence and immanence. And Noah invited his people by night by virtue of their intellect and their spirituality which is in fact the unknowable (*ghayb*). That is to say, when Noah invited at night it was an invitation to the interior (*bāṭin*) and the *ghayb* and this was due to the intelligence and spirituality of his

people, because their intellect and spirituality is unknowable, that is to say, it is qualified unknowable, because the unknowable is of two kinds. One is the Real Unknowable. That is the Absolute Ipseity and the realities of the essential Names which are the keys of the Unknowable, but the other is the qualified *ghayb* and that is the universe of order and intellect and *nafs* and spirit from which is constructed the universe. Because of this the invitation of Noah was to the necessities of isolation (*tajarrud*) and cleanliness and holiness and it is to the necessities of arming oneself away from the turbidity of the human element. The human turbidity is in a way the night, like the accumulated veils and like the dark determinations of the possibilities of the night when one considers that Man is weakened in that state. At the same time the universe of order and construction is also night as it is *ghayb* in relation and qualification to us, as well as day-time by its relationship to the universe of meanings and the Real Unknowableness, because those degrees are manifestation and witnessing. And he invited them by day equally, because of the exterior of their images and their figures. And by day, that is to say, he invited them equally again to the manifest by virtue of the appearance of their images and figures. That is to say, he invited them to the establishment of the importance of the images of nourishment and the determinations of bodily affairs with the language of the universe of witnessing. Thus Noah first invited his people by virtue of their spirituality and their intellect and the unknowable to the universe of the unknowable and isolation and disarming oneself. Consequently, as this invitation was against their necessities they did not follow it, so he then invited them according to the necessities of the manifest and the images of their bodies and the establishment of its necessities. Consequently, between the two invitations, to isolation and disarming oneself from the manifest, and on the other hand to the establishment of the necessities of the manifest orders, there came about a negation, and the people were in perplexity between the two invitations and they did not accede to his invitation. Consequently, as Noah exaggerated in the invitation, his people's perplexity and being misled increased. He did not combine in his invitation, (that is to say, between transcendence and immanence) like that which is like

Him there is not. And Noah (S.A.) did not combine between the transcendence and immanence in invitation, as Mohammed (S.A.) did combine with the words: 'That which is like Him there is not', and their interior hated this discrimination and increased them in running away. Thus, because of this discrimination, that is to say, because he invited them first to the interior and then to the manifest, their interior hated it. Thus the lack of collectivity in the invitation increased their running away.

Then he said, Noah (S.A.) informed, in himself. After that Noah (S.A.) from his own self secretly addressing himself to God (informed with the words): 'And indeed when I invited them so that You pardon them they brought their fingers to their ears and hid themselves under their clothes.' It is with these words that he informed that he invited them by night with the language of the *ghayb* to pardon (*ghafr* – to pardon by covering up their shortcomings) so that He cover up their shortcomings (pardon them), not so that He expose them. In fact, he invited his people at night with the language of the unknowable to cover up the shortcomings first, so that God cover them up, and he did not invite them so that He expose them. They understood this, that is, covering up with pardon, from him (S.A.). That is, they understood from Noah's invitation the necessity for the covering up pertaining to the visible form which their state necessitated. With that they brought their fingers to their ears and covered themselves up with their clothing. That is, it is because they understood the necessity of covering up from the words of Noah that they covered their ears with their fingers and themselves with their clothing. In other words, so as not to hear Noah's appeal they made the covering up from their clothing. Thus, in what appertains to the form in covering up in the invitation they followed and affirmed in denial and refusal, taking what there was of covering up to mean for them not to hear what Noah said, knowing well that if they heard what he said they would necessarily have to follow him. That is why in accordance with their state they took the covering up (*ghafr*, *maghfira*) from Noah's invitation to prevent them from hearing these words. And this is, all of it, image of covering up to which he had invited them. They acceded to his invitation by action, not by affirmation (*labbayka*). All

these actions and the states that emanated from them at the time of Noah's invitation is that image of covering up to which Noah had invited them. Thus their following Noah's invitation in action and not with affirmation and alacrity resulted in their covering themselves up from hearing. Had they followed with alacrity and affirmation they would not have taken this mystery by action. Thus, the fact that they understood the necessity of following the prophet's invitation when they heard it would come after having accepted his prophethood. It is not that all deniers need to take this mystery in all its aspects.

And in: 'There is not a thing similar to Him' is established the fact of being like, and its negation. In these words of the Prophet Mohammed: 'There is not a thing similar to Him', there is the establishing of similarity and the establishing of its negation, which means that Mohammed's invitation was collective of the two invitations unlike Noah's invitation which was non-collective, and because of this he (S.A.) said of his own *nafs*: 'It is that I was given the *jawāmi' al-kalim.*' This is to say that because Mohammed (S.A.) collected between the two invitations that is why he informed from his own person with the words: 'It is that I was given the *jawāmi' al-kalim.*' In fact he is given the *jawāmi' al-kalim*, that is to say that the Divine Names and the totality of their necessities were given to him. Thus the Envoy (S.A.) invites with the invitation of the totality of the forms which a word assumes.

Mohammed did not invite and pray for his people night and day, but rather perhaps he invited them to night during the day and to day during the night. That is to say, Mohammed (S.A.) did not invite his own people night and day; rather perhaps he invited them to the night in the day, and to day in the night. That is to say, he did not invite his people solely to the interior and to transcendence singularly, and to the manifest and immanence separately, but he rather invited them with the collectivity of the uniqueness, collecting between interior and transcendence and manifest and immanence, to the manifest and immanent in the interior and transcendent, and to the interior and transcendent in the manifest and immanent, because that is the encompassing of all and the collectivity of the detail and the origin.

And Noah in his wisdom said to his people: He will send a heavens over you, raining. Thus, when Noah saw the determination of the state of his people and their station, and observed their following through action, and since they had understood the requirement of covering up from demanding of pardon, Noah descended to guide them by virtue of their not being aware by using a stratagera from his own station. Consequently, he spoke with words the outward aspect of which would be suitable to their understanding it from its outward aspect, and with its interior and intellect it would be suitable to their intellect. Thus Noah (S.A.), through his wisdom, with the language of pointing pointed out to his people: if you accede to what I say according to the necessities of the intellectual transcendence, then God will send over you the heavens, that is to say, the clouds full of rain and water, and that is the intellectual cognosis in the meanings, and speculative reflection, that is to say, water is intellectual cognosis in meaning and it is equally a speculative reflection (consideration), and will help you with possessions with which you will be inclined towards Him. He will come to your assistance with possessions, that is to say, with holy incomes and pleasing revelations, and He will succour you with such things as will incline you and attract you to His side, and if He has made you incline towards Him you will see therein your own images. Thus if that holy flash and witnessable revelation attracts you towards God and makes you inclined towards Him, you will witness in that revelation the image of your own *'ayn-i-thābita*, and if some from among you imagined that they saw Him, they are not those who know, and whoever from among you knows he has seen his own *nafs*, he is the knower. Thus, a person from among you, if he imagines that he has seen God, that is to say, if he thought that the image he saw in that visible witnessed revelation was God and imagines it to be so, that person does not know God because the One Being which is revealed in the image of the *a'yān-i-thābita* is revealed by virtue of the particularities of the *a'yān* and not by virtue of Itself. And if from among you a person knows he has seen his own self, that person is a gnostic, because the true knowledge of a servant is the knowledge of his own *nafs* which is in the image of his own *'ayn-i-thābita* because God's revelation is

by virtue of the particularities of his own *'ayn-i-thābita*. Thus, what he observes is his own *nafs*. And with this, people are divided into those who are knowers of God and those who are not knowers of Him. Consequently, due to these divergencies of observation people who are of taste become divided into those who are gnostics of God and those who are not gnostics of God. That is to say, they are divided into gnostics and non-agnostics. Those who are gnostics of God are those who observe that whatever they look at, it is their own *nafs*, and the one who is not a gnostic is he who imagines that what he has observed in the image of his *'ayn-i-thābita* is the image of God.

Thus, the veiling with the manifest strengthened in the people of Noah, and their intellects became addled with conjecture (*wahm*), and they did not go beyond the ordinary thoughts and comparisons of habitual things into the isolation of the total knowledge in transcendence, and denying Noah they submitted themselves to their own comprehension. Noah (S.A.) complained to his Lord and said: 'Lord, they rebelled against me and they submitted to the one who does not increase their possession.' That is to say: Lord, they have rebelled against me and they submitted themselves to the one whose possession, that is to say, his knowledge and intellect and his reflections and considerations, did not produce any increase in him. And also his son (did not increase anything in him) and that is that which their speculative reflection produced as result for them. And equally his son did not increase anything in him, and that is that thing which their speculative reflection produced as result for them. And the order rests upon witnessing of knowledge, far from the results of reasoning. That is to say that that which is intelligent for it is that it depends on the observation of the knowledge of the order of gnosis or order of the Divine knowledge. Its knowledge is far from the results of reasoning. Consequently, speculative reflection and results through reason do not bring any increase. Only loss. Nothing other than loss, that is to say that it increased the loss of Divine gnosis because it is necessary to abdicate from the results of reasoning and speculative intellect for the heart, which is the place of the Divine knowledge and the place of arrival of Lordly effusion, and to turn with total turning to the heart of the Person of Oneness so that the

Divine knowledge results with true and real clear insight (*kashf*).

Thus their commerce did not become profitable and they were not guided. Thus, their commerce did not become profitable because the ultimate of what they looked at and the final point of the total of their knowledge and reason is to deviate from God with possessions. Consequently, as their intellectual knowledge increases, so does their veiling increase, and this happens at a distant limit from the original purpose. Consequently, they did not find guidance with that knowledge. And that which was in their hand was lost to them, all that which they in fact imagined was possession for them. Thus, what they imagined was their possession from that knowledge as reasonable conclusions at their level was lost to them because it was not built upon the origin because it was not close to witnessing (*shuhūd*) and certainty. 'And those who have covered up the Truth, their work is like the mirage of the thirsty man who anticipates water in the river-bed.' Thus, the work and the knowledge of those who cover up the Truth with intellectual conclusions dissipates like a mirage because it is not underlined by Divine corroboration and the Holy Spirit. And where it concerns the Mohammedians (the order for you is), and give to others of that which has been brought to you, (because the Mohammedians are) appointed successors therein, by which is meant that the knowledge is the possession of God and the Mohammedians are viceregents in this and it is not their possession in origin. That knowledge is bestowed on them by God, upon which He has made them caliphs. It is their possession only through being a caliph over it because their knowledge results from Divine devolvement and compassionate revelation. It is perhaps Divine knowledge which due to the complete branching of places becomes imprinted in them. Thus, addressing the Mohammedians he says: 'That knowledge which your Lord bestowed on you, over which you are the caliphs, give some of that to the poorer student demanders according to their inclination.' Perhaps they have been appointed to return to its origin the Divine knowledge, which is their possession only through the way of caliphate, which knowledge they refer to God and they appoint God the caliph over it. Thus, they should return to God the High the knowledge, which is that possession over which they were made

caliphs, and attribute it to Him and appoint Him caliph over it, and never attribute it to themselves. And in the case of Noah and the people of Noah there came (the saying): 'Do not take other than Me as agent (*wakīl*).' And concerning Noah (S.A.) and the people of Noah who were according to his taste there came the saying: 'Do not take as *wakīl* other than Me.' That is to say, when the people of Noah believed that what they had in their hands by way of caliphate was their own possession and they became veiled from the fact that what they had in their hands actually belonged to God, God confirmed them in their belief and said to them: 'What you have of possession and ownership and influence and knowledges which is in your hands is your possession, but make Me the *wakīl* over it and not anything else.' Thus they were appointed with lack of dispensing, and He proved possession for them and power of attorney therein to God. Thus, God the High proved in this *āya* for the people of Noah the possession, and for God the power of attorney over the possession, because possession is for he who appoints the *wakīl*, not for the *wakīl* himself, but He did not make them dispensing caliphs but made them possessors because God manifests in the image of their *a'yān*. Consequently, with God giving them possession they possessed the totality of the possessions but they are not possessors by their own persons. However, they have no awareness of this. Consequently, they have no right to caliphate since they do not know the true value of possession. On the other hand, the Mohammedians, by virtue of their knowledge, became worthy of caliphate. And they are caliphs over it. Thus the Mohammedians became caliphs in possession. And in some copies there occurs the word *fīhim*, 'therein', that is to say that the Mohammedians are caliphs in the case of their own persons, and the people of Noah and other peoples, because they are also of the totality of possession. And possession is God's, that is, by origin it is God's, and the Mohammedians are caliphs. He is their *wakīl*. And God is the *wakīl* of the people of Noah, and possession is theirs by making it their possession, not in reality. Thus, if God is their *wakīl* then the possession is for them since God has made them possessors, but not in reality. According to this consideration the pronoun which is in the words 'their *wakīl*' refers to the people of Noah. It is also

allowable that it should refer to the Mohammedians, that is, God has made the Mohammedians caliphs in His own possession. Consequently, possession by origin belongs to God. Although He had made them possessors by way of caliphate, yet again He asked them to return the possession to its origin as attested by His saying to the Envoy: 'There is no other God but Him and take Him as your *wakil*.' That is, He has ordered them to take Him as their *wakil* in the possession over which they have the viceregency, and that which is established for the people of Noah thus becomes established also for these latter. Consequently, possession becomes established for the Mohammedians. However, do not let there ever pass through the minds of the people who are short in Divine knowledge that because it has been said 'possession is theirs' that possession should be established for anyone other than God, and in case this ever happens the Shaykh (R.A.) said this to refute it:

This possession is possession by viceregency, and thereby possession is that God is the King (possessor) of possession. And this possession is possession of caliphate, and as this possession is possession of caliphate there became established for them that God is the possessor of the possession, because their existence is by origin God's possession, because in their being, the possessor and the possessed and the dispenser and the present is God, and God is their possession because in accordance with the order: 'Give to others of what has been brought to you wherein you are the viceregents', the possession of their being in which they are the viceregents, when they give of that to others and the possessions of knowledge and tastes and states and natures and other degrees and stations and knowledges of perfection, they give away completely and they become in accordance with the saying: 'He who was of God, God was of him', and thus God becomes their possession and what they own. It is in this meaning that the most gnostic Shaykh Abu Yazid Bastami, may God sanctify his mystery, said in his pleading to God at the time He revealed Himself to him: 'My possession is greater than Yours. The immanence is Yours and I am Yours and I am Your possession, and You are my possession and You are the Most Great of the Greatest and my possession You are, and You are greater than Your possession and that is me.'

As Tirmidhi said. This is exactly as the Shaykh Mohammed bin 'Ali al-Tirmidhi, may God be pleased with him, said. Thus the Shaykh (R.A.) witnesses that God is the possession of the possession with the words of Tirmidhi.

And they used a stratagem, a trick (*makr*), and it was a great deception because in fact invitation to God is a deception and a trick where the invited is concerned, since even from the beginning there was not a non-existence of it so that there could be an invitation as an end. Noah had used a stratagem in inviting his people to God and they had responded by the bigger trick, the leaders among the people saying to the others: 'Do not desert your gods', because to invite somebody to God is a trick for the one invited because the one invited was not made inexistent from the beginning so that the aim of the invitation be to God, which means that if the aim was to invite to God, the invited person would at the beginning have to be inexistent and that there is supposed to be a non-existence of God, because the one invited, as long as he is existent, God is with him.

Now, the reason why invitation to God the High is a trick (deceit) is this, that God is the same as the beginning and the end and the one who is invited and the one who invites, and He is the same as every possible thing. One has to suppose that God's all-covering pardon is not at the beginning with the one invited so that at the last degree he is invited to God, and this situation is an impossibility since it is difficult to imagine that God does not exist from the beginning where the person invited is concerned. Consequently, he cannot be invited to God as an aim, as an end. Consequently, to invite the person invited from the witnessing of God from a certain degree to the witnessing of God from another degree, and to make them give up the witnessing and the manifestation of God at that first degree in favour of manifestation and witnessing of God at another degree, is a deceit where the one invited is concerned. Consequently, as Noah (S.A.) manifested himself to his people with a deceit and a trick, they responded to his trick with a bigger deceit and trick in response, and they said to each other: 'Do not desert your gods, do not desert Wadd or Suwa', Yaghuth and Ya'uq and Nasr', which means that they said: do not abandon these idols because they are Divine places of

manifestation. Had they deserted them, in fact they would have deserted God manifested in them and they would have been ignorant of God to the extent of their desertion of these idols because in each idol there is a face for God. He who knows this has gnosis of God. He who does not know this is ignorant of God.

The deceit and trick of the people of Noah is according to two aspects. One aspect is this, that having heard Noah's invitation and having understood that Noah invited them to discrimination, they addressed each other, saying: 'This prophet proves a being other than the Being of God for these idols, Wadd, Suwa' and others, and telling us to abandon these idols he wants to prevent us from the witnessing of God and our praying to God in these idols, and invites us thus to discrimination, but we are in the very essence of collectivity and we observe the One Being in all the places of manifestation and we do not prove a being for anything other than Him. Thus, if you abandon and turn away from these idols according to his invitation you will have denied the Being of God manifest therein and you will have turned away from God in them.' Consequently, when Noah heard them saying to each other the words: 'Do not give up Wadd or Suwa' . . .' so as not to turn away from God and equally not to incline towards discrimination from the collectivity, he was no longer able to invite them because his invitation was to discrimination whereas they were in the essence of collectivity. Thus it is that they played a great trick on Noah (S.A.).

The other aspect is this, that they dwelt on Noah's invitation through action and not by words, in the image of denial, and they agreed to his invitation in the images of denial and refusal because they were in the place of objectivization of concordance but they had no awareness of agreeing with him or affirming him. Equally Noah was unaware that they had followed him through a deceitful stratagem and a trick. That is why this trick became a great trick against Noah and that is why they refused his invitation with the apparent word because invitation is discrimination (*furqān*) whereas they were in conjunction (*qur'ān*) in the essence of collectivity and that is why they said in covering up: He brings us God whereas we are with Ēlim, because the invited from is the same as the one invited in the

witnessing of the veridic people of *kashf* although it is not the same in the beliefs of other people. Had the people of Noah agreed with Noah openly and turned away from their well-known idols they would have turned away from God and abandoned God in their idols. That is why the deceitful stratagem of the people of Noah was bigger than the deceit of Noah. In the same way, the non-turning-away of the invited from that from which he is invited is a deceit for the inviter, because the invited, observing God in that which he is invited from and following Him there, cannot turn away from Him and follow openly the inviter. The inviter can only invite the one invited if the invited is veiled from the witnessing of God in that which he is invited away from. Just as invitation is a deceitful trick for the one invited, equally the non-agreement of the one invited to the inviter is a deceit against the inviter.

To invite to God, that is the very essence of deceit. When the High God explained the order of invitation to the Envoy (S.A.), the Envoy (S.A.) said: 'Invite to God', this word is the very essence of deceit. According to the highest degree of discernment (*baṣīra*), which means, my invitation is in accordance with the highest degree of discernment and knowledge, that is to say, from God to God. Consequently, invitation in accordance with the Mohammedian taste is not deceit because the Mohammedian invitation is not to discrimination. In general, invitation is not deceit for the witnessing gnostic but it is a deceit for the veiled 'ārif. Peace be upon him enjoined that the order is to Him, all of it. Thus the Prophet enjoined with the words: 'According to the highest discernment' that the order in totality is particular to God, which means that in his invitation according to discernment he, the Prophet (S.A.), enjoined that in his way of witnessing, the inviter, the invited and invited to and invited from are all one thing, and in consideration of various degrees they are apparent with Names of complementary opposition. Consequently, the lowest and the most descended is invited to the degree of most total and most complete. It is not the invitation with the lack of witnessing of the face of God in the invited from, just as the totality of the order is from Him and manifests with Him and is revealed and again returns to Him and is concentrated in Him. The inviter is under the Lordship

and the determination of one Name and invites with a Divine order and Lordly power, and equally the invited who agrees by action is in the same way under the dispensation of one Name and is obedient to the order to which he is appointed and knows and is expectant of the arrival of the order that is going to arrive. They agreed with him through deceit just as he had invited them with deceit. Thus the people of Noah answered their agreement to Noah with deceit since he had invited them through deceit.

And the Mohammedian came and knew that the invitation to God is not by virtue of His *huwiyya* but that it is by virtue of the Names. Thus, when the possessor of the way of thinking of the sealhood, the Mohammedian, came to invite, he knew that invitation to God is not by virtue of His *huwiyya* of Uniqueness but rather that the invitation is by virtue of His Names, because the Absolute *huwiyya* is always with totality with the encompassing of the Ipseity. That is to say that invitation is from the Lordship of one Name to the Lordship of another Name. For example, it invites from the Name *ḥāfiẓ* to the Name *rāfi'* and from the Name *muntaqim* to the Name *rahīm* and from the Name *fadl* to the Name *hādī*. But as the Divine Names by their essential particularities are distinguished one from the other, the essential particularizations which are the places of manifestation of the Names are equally distinguished one from the other by their essential aptitude, and some of them are more elevated than the others. Thus, the invitations happen from the Lordship of the Names whose determinations are narrow and particular, to the Lordship of the Names whose determinations are wider, more comprehensive and general, more total and more complete. This is because the revelation which is in the Presence of the totality of uniqueness is not the same as the revelation in the Presence of uniqueness of discrimination. Rather perhaps the ultimate purpose of manifestation and manifesting is that each of the Divine Names with its Name of essential particularity, while differentiated from other Names and while the Ipseity of Uniqueness is revealed in it by one aspect, is collective of the collectivity of all the Divine Names of the collectivity of uniqueness and is the place of manifestation of the total. This collectivity does not happen except in the place of manifestation of the Complete

Man. While he is first the place of manifestation of one Name which is his particular Lord, in consideration of the fact that he is created with all the other Divine Names and collects them in himself, and because in him manifests the perfection of the Divine Image, which collects in itself all the Divine Names, the Divine Name which is his private Lord collects in itself the totality of the Divine Names so that he may become the place of manifestation for the invitation of the collectivity of the totality of the Divine Names and the Presence of the collectivity of uniqueness from the places of manifestation of the collectivity of partial Names.

However, do not understand the invitation from one Name to the other to mean that a person is invited from the Lordship of a Name which is that person's particular and true Lord to the Lordship of another and that he would be taken out of the reality of the first Name and invited to the reality of another Name. This is impossible, because there is no changing and transforming in the Divine realities. However, even though everyone is in reality the place of manifestation of one Name, the determination of that Name while it is predominant over this emergence of genus descends from the Divine degrees being all the while coloured by the manners of being and immanential qualities, and manifests in this human genus emergence. Thus, where a quality is predominant over other qualities, that one's rulership is manifest in the other and forces the revelation of that Name which is related to that quality, and its determination becomes preponderant over the other. This happens under the Lordship of that Name, even though most of his states and his affairs are built according to the taste and the way of the Name for which he was the place of manifestation at the origin, but by way of determination and qualification Lordship and rulership belongs to that Name whose states and tastes are built according to it. And the Names which are predominant for the necessities of this emergence are the Names of Majesty and Awe (*jalāl*). Consequently, the invitation is from the Lordship of *ism-i-jalāl* to the Lordship of *ism-i-jamāl* until at last he can join the Lordship of the Name which is his origin and become the manifestation of the Divine revelations in that Name's treasury, and through their intermediary become the place of manifestation

of all. Except that if in the origin it happened that he is the place of manifestation to the *ism-i-jalāl*, there is no benefit in that in appearance he is the place of manifestation of *jamāl* and that he attracts the revelations of the Name of *jamāl* and that he appears with the perfections of *jamāl*.

Now, invitation is from the accidents of the Lordship of the Names of Awe and Majesty to the original Lordship of the Names of Beauty (*jamāl*), and this explanation is according to the consideration where in the manifest Lordship and rulership is of *ism-i-jalāl* (awe and majesty) as the necessities of the preponderant quality, and where the Lordship of the Name which is the origin of the person who is being invited, and the determinations of that Name, have remained in the interior. However, if the original Lordship and rulership is considered to be of the origin of the Name, and if that one's determination has become apparent, then invitation is from that Name's relative and partial Lordship to the total absolute Lordship of the Name which is most totalizing and prevalent from among the Names so that that Name in that man's place of manifestation collects the totality of the Names so that its Lordship change from partial relative Lordship to total absolute Lordship. In other words, let it be seen with the eye of discernment (*baṣīra*).

Now, let it be known like this, that those who invite to God are of two classes. One class invites with His permission by expounding the Divine Laws. For him it is not necessary to have the *kashf* of realities like they necessarily are with God. The other class is also of two classes. One of these is those to whom God has made *kashf* of the realities of those predications with which they are appointed to proclaim. To the other class He did not do it with *kashf*, but perhaps rather the knowledge of that thing happened to them from God by explaining to them in a veridic dream or through inspiration or Divine inspiration (*wahy*), but they are not appointed to announce it. Those who are appointed to announce it are also of two kinds. One kind is those of great resolution who are appointed with announcement of envoyship and war. The second part is the prophets who are other than of great resolution who only have to announce and nothing else. Those of the great resolution who are high in degree invite

according to discernment (*baṣīra*) like the Prophet Mohammed and Mohammedian saints, because these know that God exists at the beginning and the end and that the one invited is the same as the inviter and the invited to. They are appointed with invitation to God, and the answer happens concerning the person to whom God's Will (*irāda*) has appertained either manifestly or interiorly and it does not happen when the *irāda* has not appertained to that person except in the form of denial. The Mohammedian invites to the total and collective Name in accordance with discernment. That way includes the totality of the simple and the composite and that is the Name *Allāh* and the Name Compassionate (*raḥmān*). God is the abode or the place where all the images of collectivity and discrimination come into being. The Shaykh, God be pleased with him, bears witness that invitation is from the Lordship of one Name to the Lordship of another.

And He said: 'On the Day We shall collect the pious to the Compassionate (*raḥmān*) in throngs.' Now, piety is from the Lordship of the Name which possesses *jabarūt* and might (*saṭwa*). Consequently, the pious (*muttaqī*) is the place of manifestation and evidencing of the Name Compeller (*jabbār*). Consequently, to take precaution from its might (*saṭwa*) is taking refuge in the Name Compassionate (*raḥmān*) which is the possessor of general compassion, because compassion, by virtue of being compassion, has no might (*saṭwa*), because what it bestows is mildness, kindness and favour, inclining favourably and forgiveness and pardon. Consequently, the pious is collected for the Day of Judgement from the Name Compeller (*jabbār*), which bestows might (*saṭwa*) and grandeur (*hayba*), to the Name Compassionate (*raḥmān*), because the pious is the place of evidencing of the Name Compeller (*jabbār*) by virtue of being pious in this world; thus, transposing from the Name Compeller (*jabbār*), when they become collected at the level of the Name Compassionate, and general compassion, which is the necessity of *saṭwa*, prevails over their beings, they remain no longer as pious but become those who have been mercied and who have been pardoned. While the pious were of uncircumscribed preparation, when they become collected at the level of the Name Compassion, and because the Mercy of the Compassion pre-

vails over them, it is understood that they are invited to the Name which is more collecting and more prevalent like the Name *Allāh* and the Name Compassionate (*rahmān*). The determination of the Name *rahmān*, just as it is prevalent over all that are pious, it is also prevalent over the Name *jabbār* and other Names of awe and majesty and destruction and conquest.

Abu Yazid Bastami, God's mercy upon him, heard a man reading: 'On the Day We shall collect the pious to the Compassionate (*rahmān*) in throngs', and he shouted out: 'If a person is in the Presence of the Compassionate Beatitude and compassion is his evidence, it is surprising how he can be collected for judgement at the level of the *rahmān*.' The Shaykh al-Akbar, the Great Master, the owner of the book, the most radiant, the Red Sulphur. God be pleased with him, when he heard the surprise of Abu Yazid he said that there is no surprise in this. The surprise is in the words of Abu Yazid. It is from the Name Compeller (*jabbār*) to the Name Compassionate (*rahmān*), which means that they are brought to judgement from the Names and Qualities of *jalāl* and conquest to the Names and Qualities of beauty and generosity and subtlety (*lutf*).

He brought with the letter of *ghāya* (aim and extremity) and made it close to the Name, which means that God the High brought the letter of aim and extremity, which is 'ilā' (the preposition: to), and made it close to the Name which is prevalent over all the Names, so that it is understood that the Name Compassionate (*rahmān*) is prevalent over all the other Names and it is understood that all the Names end in it as there is no difference between it and the Name *Allāh*. From the people of the universe each group is under the Lordship of one Name from among the Divine Names, and if a person is under the Lordship of a Name he is servant of that Name. Thus the Envoy invites them from the differentiations of those Names to the Name Compassionate (*rahmān*) or to the collectivity of the Name of God (*Allāh*) and this invitation is according to discernment (*baṣīra*) because it saves them from the danger of association (*shirk*) with God and enters them to the servanthood of one Divinity. At the level of the Mohammedian invitation, the invitation is not by virtue of the *huwīyya* of God, because the *huwīyya* is present, existent, in the total,

but rather it is by virtue of the Names and it is an invitation from the Presence of one Name to the Presence of another Name.

We have known that the universe is under the care and guardianship of one Divine Name. It is necessary for them that they be pious (god-fearing) (*muttaqī*). We have known that the universe is under the care and guardianship of one Name, which Name necessitates that they be pious. Now the Name which is ruler over the people of the universe necessitates that they take care of themselves and are pious. This is the Name Compeller (*jabbār*), not the Name, the Compassionate (*rahmān*). In chapter 33 of the *Futūḥāt*, the Shaykh, may God be pleased with him, mentions the surprise of Abu Yazid al-Bastami and explains it like we mentioned above. Thus the clean-living pious man is the companion of *jabbār* and not the companion of *rahmān* so that it would be the *rahmān* that would necessitate that they become pious. In consideration of general munificence and mercy all things are the places of manifestation of the being of *rahmān*, but from the aspect of Lordship it is the pious which is the place of manifestation of the *jabbār* and is its companion, because had he been the companion of the *rahmān* he would not have been collected in judgement at the Presence of *rahmān*. Consequently, by virtue of their being pious the people of the universe are under the care and circumspection of the Name Compeller (*jabbār*) which causes them necessarily to be pious because careful living and piety is at the level of grandeur (*hayba*) and might (*saṭwa*) of the Name *jabbār*. The pious, who are the people of the universe, afterwards enter the circumspection and care and dispensation of the Name Compassionate (*rahmān*) without being pious because the Name *rahmān* removes from them the quality of piety and bestows on them leniency and pardon. Different forms of the pious are collected at the level of the *rahmān*. The reality of the piety that the Name *jabbār* bestows is this, that the pious should take God as protection from attributing to their own selves the good deeds and the beauties of perfection, and attribute them to Him as He is the actor by them and in them in all their actions, and in shortcomings and mistakes and evil again should take themselves as protection for God and attribute all these to themselves. This is so because evil is of the order of non-existence, and the origin of non-existence is a

different area of possibilities. Consequently, this is the result of the piety of the pious people, which is that the evil of their being has been changed into the goodnesses of compassion; and the thingness of a thing is a thing only because it is by virtue of place; and there is not left in their being any quality other than the quality of compassion, like piety and like the qualities of praise.

And they said in their deceit: 'Do not abandon your idols and do not abandon Wadd, Suwa', Yaghuth, Ya'uq and Nasr.' The Shaykh explains the deceitfulness of the people of Noah with this verse (*āya*). Thus Noah's people, addressing each other, that is to say, the leaders advising the others in exaggeration to increase their deceitfulness, said: 'Do not abandon your idols, Wadd, Suwa', Yaghuth, Ya'uq and Nasr, because these are the Divine places of manifestation, and the prophet who is inviting us establishes a being other than the Being of God in these and wants to prevent us from observing the face of God in them and invites us to become disunited and separated whereas we are in the essence of collectivity and we know nothing other than God.'

And if they had deserted them they would have been ignorant of God to the degree of what they deserted of these because indeed for God in everything worshipped there is an aspect. He who knows that knows it, and he who is ignorant of it does not know it. The Shaykh says here that indeed the people of Noah, when they abandoned their idols they would become ignorant of God only to the degree of that which they abandoned of their idols, because in everything worshipped there is a private aspect therein for God. The person who knows that aspect knows God. The person who does not know that aspect becomes ignorant of God, which means that in every stone, wood, sun or moon, in everything worshipped, there is a special aspect for God, which aspect remains when the veilednesses of things are destroyed. Consequently, he who knows that aspect and the face of God in each thing worshipped knows God who is particularized in the place of manifestation which is that thing worshipped. And the one who is ignorant of this aspect in that thing worshipped is ignorant of God who is therein particularized and who is revealed from its reality.

Now, 'you did not throw when you threw, but God threw.' In every essence Divinity and what you consider Divine, and servanthood and what is worshippedness and prostratoriness and prostrated-to-ness, are manifest. Thus if a person worships the veiledness and that which is implied in that essence, or if he worships what he imagines of God in that thing worshipped, he worships his own passion (*hawā*) and he is the servant of a false god (*tāghūt*) and the servant of idols which veil the Godhead and the Divine Nature (*lāhūt*). A person who worships in everything worshipped, in every image, without limiting and without particularizing, the High God who is One and Unique, in this consideration that person is a gnostic and the receiver of knowledge given by God, and a knower, and wise. He who knows this meaning knows God and His appearance in manifestation, and he who is ignorant of this is ignorant of God. In other words, he who knows this aspect knew it and he who does not know it did not know.

And He said to the Mohammedians: 'And your Lord decreed that you do not worship except Him, and He determined.' (God) said to the Mohammedians: 'Oh Mohammed, your Lord, who is the total Lord, determined that you do not worship except Him.' The worship of different and several gods by the people, and their persistence in this, is well-known. All worship to every idol is again to God and to no other, because the Person of the Divinity, which is God, is All-Glorious, which makes it impossible that there be present in any existent other than His existence and that there be something else worshipped other than Himself, because His Reality, by Its Essentiality, necessitates that He is singularized in absoluteness in being. Thus, in every place that there be a divinity and a worship it is the worship of God, and God is for worshipping, because the singularity which is particular to His Essential Absoluteness is the uniqueness of the uniqueness of collectivity. Plurality is not against it, and His singularity is not impaired by the human image, nor is it by intellectual attribution with plurality of branches. In the same way, in the essence of the order there is no plurality except in consideration, just as Man's spiritual image is one jewel and its oneness is the singularity of the collectivity of the plurality of forces and spirits, but the plurality of these forces does not impair that jewel in the light of oneness, just

as the plurality of the places of manifestation of the Names does not impair the singularity of the Lord and the Divinity which is the thing worshipped. He is the one worshipped in everything that is worshipped, and the worshipper in all that worship.

The gnostic knows who is worshipped and in what image He has manifested so that He is worshipped, and he knows that in fact the differentiation and plurality in the image of that which is worshipped is like the plurality of the members of the human sensory image and like the plurality of the spiritual powers in his spiritual image, and it is no other than God who is worshipped in each thing worshipped. Thus, a person who is the gnostic of God knows who it is that is worshipped and in what image He manifested so that He became worshipped, and he knows that in fact the plurality and differentiation in the images of the idols is like the plurality in the sensory image of the members of the person, and like the plurality of the spiritual powers in his spiritual image, and like these it is relative and qualificative. As the plurality of members and powers does not impair the sensory images and the spiritual images, in the same way the places of manifestation of the Names equally do not impair the oneness of Ipseity. Thus in everything worshipped no other thing has been worshipped except God.

The lowest of the worshippers is he who has imagined Divinity therein (in the idol). Thus, the lowest of the worshippers is the person who has imagined Divinity in the idol, that is to say, he has not observed the manifest God in every idol but imagined in each idol the Divinity and worshipped it. Consequently, the faulty and ignorant is veiled and is in unawareness of God. And if this imagining had not been, stones and other things would not have been worshipped, meaning that if the meaning of Divinity had not been imagined in each idol, stones or other things like that, such as sun, moon etc., would not have been worshipped. Because of this, because in each idol Divinity is imagined, (God) said: 'Say to them "name (designate) them"' and if they name them they would name them as stone or wood or star. God said: 'Tell your people to name their idols', and if they had named them surely they would have named them with 'stone' or 'wood' or 'star', that is, they would have designated their

idols with their names and they would not have called them with the Name *Allāh*. And if they were asked: 'Whom did you worship?' they would certainly answer: 'The Divinity', and would not be able to say: '*Allāh*' and 'there is no other than Him.' And if they were questioned as to whom they had worshipped they would certainly say 'God', that is to say, they would have said: 'We worshipped the conditioned God', and they would not have said: 'We worshipped God the High' and equally 'the Absolute Divinity.' Thus they would not have enclosed the Absolute Divinity in their idols, but rather they would have imagined Divinity in them.

The superior (gnostic) does not imagine therein the Divinity, but rather says that this is the place of revelation of God and it is necessary to revere it as sacred and not be remiss or negligent. The highest, who is the devoted gnostic and the witnesser and who has insight (*kashf*), did not imagine the Divinity in the thing worshipped but rather said that this is a Divine place of revelation and it is necessary to revere it. And the worshipper does not treat with remissness and negligence this individuated thing worshipped because rather he witnesses all things as places of Divine revelation and that this thing worshipped (idol) is also one of the places of the Divine revelation. Yet the revealed, by consideration of essence, is one, and by consideration of places of revelation through the revelation of Names, is many. The lowest, who is the possessor of the imagination, says: 'We did not worship these except that they bring us close to the proximity of God.' Thus, the lowest kind of worshipper, who is the possessor of imagining, said: 'We did not worship these except that these bring us close to the proximity of God.' The proximity is closeness and the place of arrival because he is not therein the verifier and the witness of God. Perhaps rather he imagines God there and is assiduous in veiling it and considering it as an idol.

And the highest says when he says to them: 'Your God is one God. Fide in Him when He manifests.' And the observant worshipper, who is superior and who knows, says, addressing the worshippers who have many and numerous idols: 'Your God is one God. Accept Him in whatever place of revelation He manifests.' That is to say, do not pay attention to the plurality of revelations which are individualized

with the relativity of the idols, and do not be veiled from the One Being who is revealed in them, and observing the One Face in all the places of manifestation, be tractable and docile to that.

Communicate this good news (*bashshir*) to the people of good and beautiful qualities (*muhsinīn*) who have reduced to nothingness the fire of their nature. That is to say, communicate this good news to the people of good and beautiful natures who are tractable and docile to this, that in the observation of God's grandeur and magnitude, and in their drowning in the ocean of arrival, the fire of their nature has been extinguished. And they said 'God' and did not say 'Nature', which means that they called it with the Name God, and the Divinity becomes varied with many Names, and they did not call it with the name of another thing from Nature. Thus, they said 'Divinity' and they did not say 'Nature', because the person in whom the fire of his nature has been extinguished knows from the extinguishing of the fire of his nature that Nature is effected-upon and is dispensable. Dispensing is established for God and it is not for Nature because Nature is the place where the action takes place. It is for the Names of effect like a female in comparison to a male. Immanencing is manifested in it but the order is of the intellect and has no being in the exterior, and in the same way it has no being in the *a'yān-i-thābita* because it is the same as the *a'yān-i-thābita*. It is even the same as the *haqq* with no consideration of changing. That is why God was not called by (the name) Nature as it is called with design and purpose because there exists a conjectural mutual opposition. Thus, Nature being a place wherein the action takes place and is effected, and as its power is strong, the learned people and philosophers knew it as the same as God, and having enclosed effect to it attribute it to it (the effect to Nature). But those lovers whose fire of nature has been extinguished at the level of the arrival of revelations of Majesty and Awe and whose natural determinations have been overcome underneath the Divine Qualifications, they do not prove being for Nature, but rather they prove it for the One God and the Divine Names whose effects are manifest in Nature. That is why they call it God and not Nature.

In fact, they (the people of Noah) misled many of them as they

perplexed them by counting the One by Its aspects and relationships. In fact, the people of Noah misled many people, that is to say they perplexed them in the enumeration of the One by aspects and relationships. That is to say, in the manifest they enumerated the One Existence by various aspects by virtue of the infinite places of manifestation, and in the intellect pluralizing It by unenumerated relationships like halfness, thirdness, one-fourthness (which are names of qualities), and by taking them (the people of Noah) out from the enclosedness and totality to discrimination and division, and taking them from the light of oneness and entering them to the darkness of plurality, by which they fed them, they stirred them into perplexity, and they, on their part, considering the different aspects and relationships, became perplexed between several idols and were not able to turn towards a particular direction.

And the Shaykh (R.A.) interpreted the misleading of idols by perplexity. The worshipper of idols, witnessing the One and True, by virtue of Its places of manifestation, as many, in fact even by virtue of different places of manifestation at the level of mirrors of one aspect, is prone to seeing It as varied faces. Thus, this observer, seeing the One Existent in many faces (aspects), becomes perplexed between the faces – ‘wherever they come close to, and there is the face of God’ – because for the people of perplexity there is not a particular face either in the manifested or the interior because there has not been a particularization of God in a degree at their level so that they could either in the interior or exterior condition God with it and that it be differentiated from a different consideration. Perhaps rather God has made them observe His Essential encompassing of them from all sides and revealed Himself to them from them. Thus, as the Being of God is revealed to them from all directions, they being annihilated in that revelation they cannot distinguish one face from another in their witnessing of the One Being and they cannot distinguish one aspect from another. Perhaps rather that God made them witness His own encompassing Ipseity from all aspects, which are both hidden and evident, and revealed Himself to them from them. Consequently, as the Being of the *ḥaqq* is revealed from all directions they cannot distinguish one face from another in observing the One Being because

of their annihilation and perplexity in that revelation, and they cannot distinguish one direction from another.

They did not do too much, the oppressors to their *nafs*, the purified ones who have inherited the Book. Those who have oppressed their being did not act superfluously since they are the purified who have inherited the Book. That is, the Book of collecting and discriminating was bestowed on them and they inherited it, as the quote goes: 'Then We caused them to inherit the Book, those We have purified from among Our servants. From among them there are those who have oppressed their *nafs* and those who act with moderation and those who pass beyond with good deeds.' What is meant from this verset concerning the oppressors is the Mohammedians who have oppressed their *nafs* for their *nafs* by putting aside the desires, and who have oppressed the One Being by discriminating and multiplying because they have enclosed Divinity in the oneness which is in the plurality of the opposites. They have perhaps become perplexed between the relationship of the plurality of non-existence and the Essential oneness. And he is the first of the three and comes before the ones who act with moderation and those who pass beyond with good deeds. And the Mohammedian oppressor is the first of the three in the words of God the High: 'And from among them the one who oppresses his own *nafs*, and of them the one who acts with moderation, and of them the one who passes beyond with good deeds.' Thus God has preceded him over the one who acts with moderation and the one who passes beyond with good deeds, because the vision and viewing of the oppressor is from one to the many. The sage Tirmidhi, God be pleased with him, says in his *Ṣaḥīḥ*, as told by Abu Sa'id, that the Envoy (S.A.) said concerning this verse: 'All of them are in the same place and all of them are in paradise.' The oppressor enumerates the one and sees the oneness in plurality. The one who acts with moderation observes the one and the plurality in the one and the one in the plurality and unites between the two visions. The one who passes beyond unites the number and sees the plurality as one. Thus the one who acts with moderation and the passer-beyond are not people of perplexity because they consider both the *ḥaqq* and the *khalq*, but the Mohammedian oppressor is different to them because

he, considering the True One, observes Him as plural. Consequently, he is forever and on possessor of perplexity (wonderment – *ḥayra*) and God increases always his wonderment (*ḥayra*). Only the misleading, that is to say, *ḥayra*. Only the misleading, that is to say, increase the wonderment, because their desert is this, that God does not give them an increase in any other thing than being misled because their perfection is in their annihilation in the *aḥadiyyat al-‘ayn* (uniqueness of ‘*ayn*). Thus for them there is no ‘*ayn*’ left in the manifest, and the between is removed from between and they have been guided to the uniqueness of ‘*ayn*, and the *ḥayra* which is mentioned for the Mohammedian is the one mentioned by the tongue of Noah or other languages, but in the *ẓāhir* the *ḥayra* which has come through the Mohammedian tongue is this one:

The Mohammedian said: ‘Increase me in You in *ḥayra* (wonderment).’ ‘My Lord’ said the Mohammedian, ‘increase for me the *ḥayra* in You’, because the taste of the vision of that Bounteous Face is present in every place of revelation, and if what is observed is increased, vision is also increased. Under this consideration the word ‘Mohammedian’ becomes removed. Each time it is illuminated for them they walk in that, and when it is made darker for them they stop. These are the qualifications of the wonderment of the Mohammedians. That is to say, whenever God illuminates them with the revelation of the Light of uniqueness they follow (*sulūk*) in that light because at the level of uniqueness the revelation removes the different aspects and the contrasting and mutually distinct determinations which enumerate and increase the One Being. Consequently, in the following, when the enumeration which causes the wonderment (*ḥayra*) is removed by the revelation of oneness, *ḥayra* is also removed. Consequently, they follow with that Light of oneness in the oneness. And if sometimes there is a shadow of oppression over them because of veiling and covering up through the predications of plurality, they stop in wonderment, and then again their following is the Divine Light. For the people of wonderment there results turning, and the movement of turning is around the pole from which it is not detached. (Note: do not confuse this pole, which is the central point of the circle, with the Pole who is the central Pole of universal affairs.)

In other words, the one who is in *ḥayra* is not detached from the centre but encircles it at the same time. That is to say, the one in *ḥayra* observes the central point of the oneness of the *ḥaqq* and turns around it with the enumeration of aspects. In other words, he turns with God with whichever reason He makes him turn and he moves with Him, from Him, whichever direction He takes. Yet, due to the plurality of visions his sight is dimmed, and by the necessities of the multiplicity of aspects and places of manifestation he is in perplexity and wonderment and is disorientated. There is no beginning nor end to his movement. His movement is the movement of God, beginning from Him and ending in Him.

And the person of the protracted way inclines outside of the aim and he requires that thing in which he is the possessor of an imagination, which is his aim. And the one with the protracted way inclines from the centre towards the circumference, and is outside of the aim, and he desires that thing for which he has an imagination and his aim is to that. In other words, this person inclines towards the circumference from the centre and he is the veiled ignorant who instead of witnessing the *ḥaqq* in himself and in each of the places of manifestation imagines Him to be outside and away from his *nafs*, and he turns his face towards that imagined image at some distance, which is in the image of what he imagined, and desires that. He has inclined away from God and outside the purpose, and according to his supposition becomes distanced from God because he has deviated from the Divine aspects which are witnessed in himself and in other places of manifestation and faced the image of his imagination for which image he has created this imagination in himself. He then has an imaginary and brought-about Lord and God, and his following ends up in that imagination. For him there is from and to and that which is in between the two. That is to say, like he has conjectured, there is a beginning which is from his *nafs* and he follows from there. In reality this beginning from is from the God which he has imagined, and it takes him to, that is to say, there is an end to it which is the reaching of the aim of that imaginary God which he has imagined, and there is also the distance which lies between the from and to, which is the beginning and end, which distance he conjectured to be the road

to God. Consequently, in his movement he is constantly away from God, because at the beginning he left God and as long as he is at a distance from that he is at a distance from God.

For the person who is of the circular movement there is no possibility that there should be a beginning so that it would need from, and no end so that towards could determine over him. For the person who is of the circular movement there is no possibility that there should be a beginning so that it would need from, and no end so that towards could determine over him. In other words, for the person of circular movement, as there is no beginning there cannot be the necessity for an aim or end so that he should be under the predication of a towards in his movement. For him there is the most complete and perfect being. For the person of circular movement there results the most complete and perfect being because he is in total encompassment and his movement is with God and in God which is the movement of God. And he has been bestowed with the *jawāmi' al-kalim wa-l hukm* (expression of few words of wide meaning and determination). And he has been bestowed with the *jawāmi' al-kalim*: 'We have given you the *jawāmi' al-kalim*.' The possessor of the *jawāmi' al-kalim* is our prophet Mohammed (S.A.), and also those of his people who follow him and who are the lovers and the beloveds for whom it has been said, addressing the Prophet: 'Say: If you love God, follow me and God will love you.' These words came addressed to Mohammed, and their place of witnessing is the face of God. Because of their errors (and here 'their errors' refers to the high group of people of the most complete and perfect being and it is for them that the *āya* came where it was said: 'For their errors they will drown and enter the fire and there will not be for them a helper other than God.') Thus, because of that by which they erred, those errors made them go beyond the confines that were theirs, in other words, their errors made them emerge from the confines of their particularizations and misled them from their lines of direction, thus they transgress by virtue of the fact that the witnessing is revealed to them in the One and the Unique. And they drowned in the oceans of knowledge of God and that is wonderment (*ḥayra*). Thus, they were drowned in the 'steam' of the knowledge of God, and that ocean of knowledge

of God is wonderment. Thus, they were lost in the uniqueness which is prevalent in the totality and revealed in the images of plurality, and they remain in wonderment in the witnessing of the 'ayn from the particularization, and in the witnessing of the oneness in the 'ayn of plurality. And they were entered into the fire in the essence of the water. Thus, they were made to enter the fire which was in the essence, the source and the sameness of water, which means that they were entered into the fire of oneness when they witnessed the oneness in the 'ayn of plurality, or else, they were entered into the fire of the revelation of the glory and majesty of the face in the 'ayn of the water which is the 'steam' of the knowledge of God, which water is that true life through which everything takes life. He used the word 'fire' for the oneness, and 'water' for knowledge, because the glory and majesty of oneness burns and because in the knowledge of God results the real life. The totality of oppositions is special to the Mohammedians. Consequently, at the level of the existence of life and knowledge there is no more forceful wonderment than the wonderment which comes from the witnessing of drowning and burning, and He brought to witness concerning the Mohammedians the existence of fire in the 'ayn of water with the words: 'When the oceans become turbid and are inflamed.' Then he said: And for the Mohammedians is: 'When the oceans become turbid and inflamed.' Concerning the Mohammedians there came the *āya*: 'When the oceans become turbid and inflamed.' The oven is inflamed when it is lit, that is to say, Arabs say the oven is inflamed when it is lit. That is to say, when he says: 'I lit the oven' the oven became inflamed (and he uses the same word, '*sajara*', both for the oven and the seas becoming turbid and inflamed). The fire is in the 'ayn of water, thus that which is the same as the oceans of Divine knowledge which encloses the total is the same as the fire of the revelation of the glory and majesty of the face of oneness. And for them there is no helper other than God. That is, they have found no other helper from among idols and other immanentia particularizations because the Essential revelation has burnt away their being. Consequently there remained no other helper than God that could help them, but God brought them to life with His own Being, and helped them. And God is (from all time) the very

same as their helper and they are in annihilation there forever. Thus God the High became their helper and they became annihilated in God forever. And their annihilation in God is the same as remaining (*baqā*) and life. He is the Possessor who enriches and He is the Helper who revives.

If God had taken them out to the shore it would have been to the shore of Nature and would have brought them down from this elevated station. If God the High had taken them out to the shore of Nature from the sea of the knowledge of God, He would have brought them down from this elevated degree, and they would have been veiled from the witnessing of oneness by the plurality of particularizations. It is, and was from all time, that all was God's and by God, in fact it is God. In fact, if all is God's and by God, perhaps in reality it is God. That is to say, as totality is for God in the essence of collectivity and in the degree of Divinity, that which is particularized in the shores of Nature, in fact also the totality of the images of Nature and the particularizations of possibilities, are for God, that is to say, they are particular for the Divine places of manifestation and they are by God. That is to say, they are by the Being of God, perhaps even are God, who with the Names of opposition at the degree of Divinity is manifest at different, one to the other, degrees of manifestation.

Noah did not say 'My God' but he said 'Lord'. In fact for Lord there is establishment. Noah (S.A.) in his prayer said 'Lord'. He did not say 'My God' because what is intended from the Name 'Lord' is the Ipseity with that quality by which Noah's necessities would be decreed (*qaḍā*). That is to say, when he cried out in pleading for an order, the Name that is particular to that order is a Name from among the Divine Names, and for the Name 'Lord' there is establishment in the quality which is sufficient for its effect, which quality does not change into another quality. That is why he said 'Lord'.

And the Divinity is variable by Its Names and He is every day in a different configuration. And Divinity is variable with the Divine Names. Thus, He is in every instant in a different configuration and revelation, because Divinity contains all the Divine Names and He is revealed in the totality of them in every instant. That is why there is no establishment there. What there is, is variability and change. This

is why at the degree of Divinity He qualified His Ipseity with the words: 'Every day He is in a different configuration.' By 'configuration' is meant particularization and revelation and relativization. Lordship is nothing other than dispensing in that which regards Him as Lord, and it transports that which regards Him as Lord, when it has reached the end of its education, from one manner to another.

His intention by (saying) 'Lord' was for the establishment of the proper complexion. Thus Noah (S.A.) desired the establishment of the proper complexion (*talwīn*) in crying out with the Name 'Lord', that is to say, with the quality and qualification which would be sufficient to what was important, and in the manner which would be suitable to his aim in this prayer, and that is God's establishment with the revelation and manifestation in this quality, and that is again *talwīn* (establishment of the proper complexion). (Note: the only true establishment among mystics is the complexity of the change in complexion which is tantamount to a total ecstasy and enstasy.) As no other than this is suitable for or true to it, because in the degree of Lordship nothing other than the establishment of the proper complexion is true, especially in the station of agreeing to a prayer. And the prayer of Noah (S.A.) is this: Do not leave on earth, by which words he meant: do not leave any of them on the face of the earth, meaning, do not abandon them in the earth of discrimination and manifestation. He prayed over them that they be brought to abide in the inside (of the earth). Noah prayed that they be made to abide inside the earth, by which he meant: please do not leave them upon the earth of discrimination but enter them into the interior of uniqueness and totality because, as God says, 'He is the only abode'. And this is the prayer of Noah, which is that they reach the Lord which is in the interior of the earth. The Mohammedian says: 'Had you been lowered down on a rope to the very interior of the earth, indeed you would fall or descend upon God.' This means that according to the understanding that God is the Light of the heavens and earth, God is manifested and revealed from the totality of the higher particularizations and of the lower personifications and He is the *huwiyya* of all the particularizations, and high and low in relation to Him are the same, and He is the same as the above as He is equally the same as

the below. 'All that is on earth and in the heavens is His.' In the places of manifestation of the images of immanence, which are the heavens and the earth, the manifestation of God is therein established, and that which is in the interior of these things, that interior is also for God, yet by virtue of particularizations it is the plurality of immanence which is the image of immanence in manifestation, and the plurality which is in differentiation in the Essence of God in uniqueness and interior is in annihilation. Thus, this establishes the manifest and the hidden for God. God being the manifest, the multiplicity, the differentiation, and the interior and the oneness and the totality, all things which are in the heavens in the universe of spirits, and the earth in the universe of bodies, are particular to Him and are His *kuwiyya*. And if you are buried in it you are therein and He is your envelope. That is, if you are buried in the earth you result in it with Him as your envelope. Thus God is with you even in the envelope of the earth. 'And He is with you wherever you be.' This means that He addresses each of the particularizations of the particularizations in manifestation and says the image of particularization is passing, and you, in the interior and in the essence of totality, are in annihilation, and in that state you are established in annihilation in Him and the interior of oneness is your envelope. The envelope is by consideration of the particularization which is enveloped and entered into non-particularization and the relative and the manifested being solidified in the absolute and in the interior, and when the relativity of particularization is removed from the One Being it returns to the absolute as it was in the absolute before particularization.

And We return you into it and We take you out of it another time because of the variety of aspects. What is meant is that We return you into the earth and at another time We bring you out of it because of the variety of the aspects, because aspects by virtue of particularizations are variable. This again means that the plurality of particularizations which are manifest in the images of immanence are returned to the interiority and annihilated in the singularity of the Essence of God, and then again We bring them out and manifest them in places of manifestation of immanence and variable particularizations. This is done for making justice dwell, because in

the emergence of the world, by the necessities of qualities preponderant over the *nafs*. the assembly of every *nafs* and human aspect being variable, each necessitates determination from the Name Determiner from the Divine Person according to its collective image which results from its spiritual assembly and its nature and its qualities.

It is also possible that the words used above: ' . . . because of the variety of aspects' can mean the aspects of the Divine Names, that is, because of the 'variety of the aspects of the Divine Names in the Presence of Divinity that is why He takes people out. Thus God is manifest and interior and is both the starting point and also the point of return. Consequently, He is manifest and revealed with all the aspects of the Divine Names because the Divine Presence necessitates manifestation with aspects of different Names. Of these coverers-up of Truth who covered themselves up in their clothes and brought their fingers to their ears, demanding covering up, which means that of those disbelievers who covered themselves with their clothes, and their ears with their fingers, demanding the covering up, do not leave any upon the face of the earth, because they covered themselves up with their clothes and put their fingers in their ears in demanding covering up, because under the determination of their veiling what they understood from *ghafr* (God's covering up from shortcomings, and pardon) was to be covered up, so they chose to be covered up by their clothes and their fingers (instead of praying for God's covering up). (Do not leave) any of them at all, all around, until it be of general benefit, just as the invitation was general. Do not leave one person even, until the benefit becomes general, just as the invitation was general. That is to say, Noah (S.A.), to be able to bring his people from the servanthood of the images of Names, as they were veiled with plurality to the detriment of oneness, to the action of taking refuge in the happiness of the uniqueness of the face of Ipseity away from the variations of aspects of the Names which is the destructive void of being away from God's grace, had invited them to come out into the Light of the Beauty of Ipseity away from the veils of shadows of awe. Consequently, at the level of Noah (S.A.) it became clear that they were people of veils, that they would not worship anything other than the images of the plurality of the Names and that invitation would

not benefit them other than increase their being veiled. He prayed to his Lord, the Helper, with the Names Conqueror and Destroyer and Avenger, so that the images of their variations would be covered with the uniqueness of the Name *bātin* in the collectivity of uniqueness which is the interior of the earth of differentiation, together with their manifest particularizations which were in the outside of the earth of differentiations, just as they had covered up their own aptitudes, so that the benefit of the effect of the invitation be general which would be their salvation by returning them to oneness from plurality and prevent them from prolonging into distance and differentiation so that also they do not mislead and perplex the believers left among them, consequently that the benefit be equally general just as the invitation was general.

In fact, if You abandon them, that is to say, those that You have invited, and then left them, they will mislead Your servants, that is to say they will perplex them and will take them out of the servanthood to what there is in them of the mysteries of Lordship, and they will view themselves as Lords after they have been in their *nafs* servants; and they are both servants and Lords. This means: Oh Lord, if You abandon the coverers-up of Truth in this world of differentiations, and if You do not enter them into the singularity of the collectivity of the Ipseity in the interior, they will mislead Your servants, that is, they will lead them to perplexity and will take them out of servanthood to what there is existent in them of the mysteries of Lordship. Thus they will view themselves as Lords after having been at the level of their *nafs* only servants. Thus they are both servants and Lords. That is to say, if You abandon them on the earth of differentiation to their passions they will be manifested with their carnal connections. Consequently, they will not be motivated to anything other than rebellion and error, and they will perplex Your servants by inviting them to selfness, away from absolute servanthood which is their essential quality, and they will bring them out with the existence of the powers of the *nafs* and qualities of animality existent in them to the mysteries of Lordship. The Prophet said: 'The worst of Man is upon whom comes the Day of Judgement and he is still alive', that is, that he be aware of the mysteries of Lordship while in him

exist the powers of the self. It is true that their interiors are the places of manifestation of the mysteries of Lordship and that the Names of the Presence of Lordship are revealed to their interiors, but their exteriors are absolute servanthood. Thus, deviating from servanthood they view themselves as Lords by virtue of the mysteries of Lordship while their exterior is a servant. That is to say, they transpose themselves from servanthood to Lordship after they have been aware that they are servants, perhaps even while they were servants of their *nafs*, because in fact they are outwardly servants and in their interior Lords, but deviating from servanthood and attacking the mysteries of Lordship they incline to the side of deviation and they respond to the invitation of the Name Misleader. Consequently, their salvation and the salvation of those who come after them is this, that they be covered up in the interior of the earth as they are covered up from hearing the call, and that they be drowned in the oceans of the inundation of insight and collectivity. And they do not bring forth, as though they do not bring forth a result, and do not show except that which is dissolute, that is to say, that which is hidden to the person who is the place of manifestation. Coverers-up (*kuffāran*), that is to say, they cover up that which has manifested after its manifestation. That is to say, they are so dissolute that they are coverers-up (*kuffūr*). That is to say, they cover up what is apparent after it has been apparent. In other words, they are coverers-up of Truth by covering up the Divine Reality with their selfhood. Their children also appear in the image of their mystery because the child is the mystery of its father. They also do not bring to a consequence the Lordship which is hidden in them and the hiding of which is necessary. With the persistence of their selfhood they make apparent the dissolute which manifests with the pretension of Lordship because apparentness is dissolution and what was necessary for them was to manifest with servanthood, and hiding and covering up of the mystery of Lordship which was in them. They do not show anything except the absolute Lordship which they show and with which they are apparent, and the Divine Reality which they cover up is apparent in them with its image having become manifest in them which they cover up with their own self. And they show that which is covered up and then they cover it up after

it is shown. By pretending to what is hidden in them of Lordship they expose it, and after it is exposed they cover it up. This means again that they show what there is hidden in them of the mysteries of Lordship and cover up the servanthood, and when that thing is manifest in their image then they cover it up with their selfhood, and then they confine it to their apparent selfhood. That is to say, they do not relate to the One Existent the mystery of Lordship which is particularized in their image and they do not observe that It has manifested in them with Lordship but rather they relate that Lordship to their own manifest particularization and thus they cover up the Lordship of God. Consequently, they become both places of manifestation and coverers-up and they become both *kāfir* (denier of Reality by covering it with something else) and *fājir* (dissolute). What is meant by *kuffār* (plural of *kāfir*) according to the Mohammedian taste is those who cover up the oneness by their particularizations (*ta'ayyunāt*). And what is meant by their children or by their results is the images of their mysteries, and they bring out the oneness and collectivity into plurality and numerality. And if You ever through the ages bless them with a long life and colour them with the Light of being and manifestation, they will bring about nothing other than dissolution and nothing other than appearing with that thing which it is necessary to clothe in the mysteries, and nothing other than claiming the Lordship, which is in them, with violence and oppression, and nothing other than covering up Your Essential Lordship from manifesting completely after covering it up with the singularity of collectivity of the totality of order. Even though these are servants to You they do not pray to You except with discrimination in their being and their passion, but with their manner and visions they fight against You in the singularity of the totality of Divine Nature (*lāhūt*) until they end up with dissolution and rebellion. They even showed the non-existent relationships to the essences of being, and having considered them as Lords they prayed to them in complete servanthood and covered up the reality of the collectivity of uniqueness with the rebelliousness of inferred veiling. Consequently, drown them from the attainment of differentiation with the understanding of light of insight (*kashf*) and the deluge of what is clear, and annihilation.

Or else, the meaning of the phrase: ‘. . . they do not show except that which is dissolute’ could also be as follows: they do not show anything other than dissolution, which dissolution would manifest the oneness which is covered with plurality, and after showing it cover it again with the plurality of particularizations. Thus they show the oneness which is covered and then afterwards they cover up what they have shown. In other words, at the same time they manifest God and cover themselves up and in another moment they cover up God and manifest themselves, as God is both manifest and hidden.

And the one that looks at this is perplexed and does not know what the dissolute intends by his dissolution or what the *kāfir* intends in his *kufr*, and it is all the time the same person. Thus, the onlooker who desires God becomes perplexed in this manifesting and covering up and does not know for what purpose the dissolute is in dissolution and why the *kāfir* is in *kufr*. In other words, the same person would at one time manifest with Lordship and cover up his own servanthood when all the time that person who is both manifesting and covering up is the same one person. And then at another time he covers up the Lordship and manifests with servanthood. Thus the person who views this one person’s showing and covering up, which are his two states, becomes perplexed between the two states and will not know which of these states he should follow. Consequently, these people increase the perplexity of those who follow them.

Lord, cover me up in pardon, that is, cover me up and cover that which is of my determined time. That is to say: Lord, cover my particularized selfhood with the Light of Your Essence, and with the Light of Your Qualities cover up all my work and my characters, and cover up from me the powers of my *nafs* and my nature so that I become freed and saved from being manifested by them and with them, and let me be completely annihilated with my ipseity and qualities in Your Ipseity and Qualities.

Let my station and value be not known, like Your value is not known, as in Your words: ‘*Wa mā qadarū Allāha ḥaqqa qadrihi.*’ Thus, my station and value should not be known, just as Your value was never known, because of Your words: ‘*Wa mā qadarū Allāha ḥaqqa qadrihi*’ (They do not appreciate God to the reality of His value – to

the value He deserves). In other words, let my selfness of essence be annihilated and destroyed in the *huwiyya* of Your Unknowableness, and let it be elevated to the place of in between and of two, which is between the Unknowable and the Witnessing, and my station and value become unknown with my being being annihilated in You, and thus become unknown just as Your value is unknown. That is to say, as Your Ipseity is unknowable, let me also be with my ipseity unknown by virtue of being annihilated in You, because I have no being or ipseity other than Your Ipseity, and in my being there is nothing other than You that has any determination.

And my parents from whom I am the result and who are Intellect and Nature. And equally cover up my two parents, those two from whom I am the result and who are Intellect and Nature. Thus, he has made Intellect the father, and Nature the mother, because in the emergence of the great universe Intellect is the actor and Nature is the acted-upon. Consequently, the image of the perfection of mankind is born from between the Intellect and Nature. What is meant by Intellect and Nature in the emergence of mankind is spirit and *nafs*, and the result is the perfect human heart because the human heart is born from between the spirit and the *nafs*. And address happens also from the degree of the heart. That is to say, cover up the spirit and the *nafs* so that from them also no name, no character, may remain, and also their station and their value be not known. (And also cover up) he who enters my house, that is, my heart, being a believer, that is to say, testifying to what there is therein of Divine information, and that which is a saying (*ḥadīth*) of their *nafs*. That means to say that cover up also that person from the realities of the powers of the spirit and of Nature who has entered my house, which is my heart, as a believer, that is to say confirming and corroborating those things which are there in the heart of Divine information, and what he means by the words of the Prophet (S.A.) which say 'which is a saying of their *nafs*' is that he means by the word 'saying' (*ḥadīth*) the *nafs*, that is to say the thing that the people's *nafs* have said, and it is extended in my heart from them as Divine information. This is because the heart, which is the place of manifestation of Divine Light and the place of revealing of Divine revelation, is cleaned of the

worries of Nature and the qualities of the *nafs*, and sanctified. That which arrives therein and descends to it is Divine inspiration (*ilhām*) and Lordly inspiration (*wahy*), and what is said therein as arriving from the *subhān* is according to the original cleanliness and the place does not change it. However, in the heart of the person who is at the degree of *nafs*, the sayings of the *nafs* which happen therein are coloured with the qualities of that *nafs*. Thus, the sayings of the *nafs* at the degree of the *nafs* are at the degree of the heart Divine information. The Shaykh, may God be pleased with him, interpreted the two parents as Intellect and Nature, and in the same way he interprets that which enters the heart as sayings of the *nafs*, because the Divine informations are from the higher direction and the sayings of the *nafs* are from the lower direction, which means: also cover up things which enter the heart from the sayings of the *nafs* so they enter the heart believing that which has entered the heart as Divine information. Consequently, he asked for the covering up of the sayings of the *nafs*, which the Prophet (S.A.) pointed out to them with the words 'that which their *nafs* have said to them', because: 'My earth and My heavens cannot contain Me but the heart of the believing servant can contain Me', in accordance with which at the station of *fanā'* in God, God's Selfness is present in the place of the servant's selfness and the Divine revelation ends all else in the heart other than God. There is nothing remaining therein. Consequently, the person who believes in the sayings of the *nafs* as Divine information, when he enters the heart he is coloured by the colour of the revelation and is covered with it.

(Also cover up) the believers who are from the Intellect and the female believers from the *nafs*. And do not increase for the oppressors, who are the oppressors from among the people of the Unknown who are enshrouded behind veils of darkness, do not increase their perdition, that is, other than annihilation. And the oppressors who are the people of the *ghayb* who are enshrouded behind veils of darkness, do not increase their perdition, that is to say, other than annihilation. The word 'oppressors' (*zālimīn*) is derived from 'darknesses' (*zulumāt*). (S.A.) said: 'Oppression is the darknesses of the Day of Judgement.' That is to say, behind the veils of darkness and the covers

of bodies, by virtue of drowning in the Unknowable, enshrouded and in the important affairs of Holiness, veiled from the vision of the eyes (onlookers), these oppressors, for them do not do more to them than their annihilation in You.

They do not know their own *nafs* and witness them, the face of God being before them. That is, they do not know their own *nafs* because they observe the face of God, as they cannot observe their *nafs*, that is to say, because of their total annihilation in the witnessing of the perfection of God, so that they cannot know or witness their *nafs*. These words of Noah are according to the Mohammedian language, but the altogether Mohammedian language is: For the Mohammedians everything is annihilated except His face. These words are not connected with what has preceded, which means that 'everything is annihilated except His face' is what arrived concerning the Mohammedians, so according to the above-mentioned interpretation it is Mohammedian in language, but according to this other it is Mohammedian in language clearly and without interpretation, which means the totality of everything is annihilated except His face which is not annihilated. The face of a thing is its ipseity and its reality, and the presence of that thing is through that. That is to say, the particularization of everything is annihilated except the face which is particularized in it which is that thing's reality, and that is not annihilated. Further can be said, that the totality of everything is annihilated except the face of God which is in it is not annihilated. Equally, in this way the particularized faces which are in the totality of things are both annihilator and annihilated in the Unique and Essential face which is both non-particularized and absolute.

And he who desires to know the mysteries of Noah, upon him be peace, for him there is advancing to the Sphere of Yoh. That is to say, if anybody wants to know more of the mysteries of Noah (S. A.), for him there remains the ascension to the Sphere of the Sun in spirit because most of the mysteries which are of the knowledge and determination of Noah can be discovered (*kashf*) by ascending to the Sphere of the Sun which is the very high place which is the beginning of the emergence of the Pole (*qutb*). In other words, and it is in our *Tanazzulāt-i-Mawṣiliyya* (Revelations of Mosul). And salutations, the

Sphere of Yoh is written in our book 'The Revelations of Mosul', and the mysteries of Noah are mentioned therein, and the mysteries of other prophets are also mentioned. Consequently, he who wants to know the mysteries of Noah, let him apply himself to the Sphere of Yoh which is mentioned in the *Tanazzulāt-i-Mawṣiliyya*. *Tanazzulāt-i-Mawṣiliyya* is the name of a book which the Shaykh wrote in the town of Mosul. And the Shaykh (R.A.) interpreted that which concerns the people of Noah according to the interior, and God knows.

The Wisdom of Sanctity
(*al-ḥikmat al-quddüsiyya*)
in the Word of Idris (Enoch)

The conjunctive phase of the Word of Enoch to the Wisdom of Sanctity was mentioned in the index.

The relationships of height are two, height of place and height of rank and position. Both these heights are resultant for the sun, but the resulting of the height of place is because the sun is the highest of the spheres (*falak*) of possibility and place because it is the middle of all spheres. However, the resulting of the height of rank and position is due to the fact that it is the centre and is the cause of the being of the surroundings and is also the highest of the places because it also combines between the two heights. And the height of place: 'And We raised him to a high place', and the highest of the places is that place whereupon the universe of spheres turns in a rotary motion like a millstone, and that is the Sphere of the Sun. The height of place becomes established then for Idris, and this verset: 'And We raised him to a high place' denotes that it is the Sphere of the Sun, which means that We raised Enoch to a high place which is the Sphere of the Sun. Consequently, as the Sphere of the Sun incorporates both heights it is the highest of places, and therein is the spiritual station (*maqām*) of Enoch. Thus the spiritual station of Idris is in the Sphere of the Sun.

Now, height of place is a thing's being in the highest of places, and the height of position and rank is a thing's being in the highest degree. Even if it is not a place or it is in the lowest of possibilities it is related to the highest sphere, like the high degree of the Perfect Man, and for Idris the reason for the establishment of height of place is this. This is because Idris was not stripped of spiritual *ta'ayyun* and did not reach the Mohammedian essential union by being obliterated in the 'ayn of the Uniqueness of the Ipseity and by being divested of

the totality of qualities of otherness. He was rather divested of the natural qualities of humanity and was stripped of the elemental emergence and its predications and remained with spiritual qualities as a form (image) (*hay'a*) of light. Thus his dark *nafs* was changed into the form of the form of the spirit of light. Equally his image was changed into the image of similarity (*mithāl*) of light which is suitable to light form. Thus he was lifted up to the Sphere of the Sun which is its original home and natural station. This place is the beginning of the descent of the spirit of the Pole because the spirit of this sphere is the most honourable of the heavenly spirits, just as the spirit of the Pole is the most honourable of the human spirits. It is because of this mystery that the sun is the most honourable of the stars and the leader of the heavens and connects with the totality of the stars, just as the people of possession have connections with the possession which are in some ways high and in some ways low. Thus the Sphere of the Sun is the most inexpugnable of the spheres and the most central, just like the place of the possessor of a realm is in the middle of the realm because middle is the most superior of places and the place most protected from mischief and intrigue. In the same way, in relation to the spheres it is like the pole, and from its rotary motion and its traversing, the orders of the universe become regulated and calculations and times become disciplined.

And under it seven spheres and above it seven spheres and itself the fifteenth, and those above it, the Sphere of the Red which is Mars, and the Sphere of Jupiter and the Sphere of Saturn and the Sphere of Mansions and the Starless Sphere and the Sphere of the Constellations and the Sphere of the Chair and the Sphere of the Throne. The Sphere of Mansions is where all the established things are and that is why it is called the Sphere of Mansions because even the Mansions of the Moon are there. As for the Sphere of Constellations, it is divided into twelve mansions, and each mansion is known through the images of stars among which it is, which are established in the Sphere of Mansions which is below it. And those which are below it are the Sphere of Venus and the Sphere of the Scribe and the Sphere of the Moon and the Globe of Ether and the Globe of Air and the Globe of Water and the Globe of Earth. The Sphere of the

Scribe is Mercury. And from the point of view that it is the pole of the spheres it is the most elevated place. Thus the Sphere of the Sun being the pole of the spheres it is the most elevated place, and God named the Sphere of the Sun 'the very high place' because it is the heart even though the spheres above it are higher. Thus, what God intends from height of place is the height of rank of the place. Consequently, for this place results the high degree of position.

Now, there is height of place which is real and of the Ipseity like the height of the Divine Ipseity, and there is place which is qualificative by relationship to a high place. Consequently, the highest of places is the Sphere of the Sun because it is the middle of all. This place is the place of the spirit of Idris, upon him be peace, and the place of his spiritual body. Thus his height is height of place.

And the height of position, it is for us, that is to say, for the Mohammedians. God said: You are the heightened ones and God is with you in this height, and He is far above all places but not from position (rank). The height of position is established for us, that is to say, the Mohammedians, because God said concerning these: 'And you are the heightened ones (*al-a'lūn*) and God is with you in this.' That is, although He is high above any place (*makān*) it is not so of rank (*makāna*). That is to say, for the Mohammedians the establishment of the height of position and rank is through the words: 'You are the heightened ones', because the collectivity of singularity and Mohammedian totality is the highest degree of all the degrees. At the same time, the High God is heightened beyond any condition by His Essential Singularity and His transcendent Absolute Being. Thus, when He establishes for us a height and says that He is there with us, it is to make us understand that our height is height of position and rank and it is the height of Mohammedian total singular essential height, and in this height God's Singularity is with us due to our transcendence and absoluteness, because the High God is by virtue of His Ipseity upon absoluteness, consequently is high beyond place because place (and possibility) is place (and possibility) by being with Him, and it is not higher than position and rank and this is so because His degree in the Absolute Being is higher than His degree which is in the relative being.

And when people of action and work from among us were frightened He followed the togetherness with the words: 'and He will not decrease anything of your works', and action, work, requires place, and knowledge requires position, rank, so He joined for us between the two elevations, the height of place by work, the height of position by knowledge, which means that when some from among us who are people of action and works were frightened when God established for us His togetherness when He qualified us with height through His words: 'And you are the heightened ones and God is with you', some of the Mohammedian people who are people of good works and who are people of action in that way who have no knowledge of the Divine realities, understood from this 'height' the height of position because God is transcendent from place, and that the establishment of height is through knowledge, and thus they were frightened of losing the rewards of the work. God followed the togetherness in His words: '. . . and God is with you' with the words: 'and He will not decrease anything of your works', meaning, God will not decrease any reward from your bodily actions and their recompense because the degree of elevation by knowledge is not contrary to the degree of place by action. Work requires place, knowledge requires position. For works results the height of place and that is the *sidrat al-muntahā*, the Lotus Tree, which is the attainment to the highest goal and the ultimate achievement whereat ends the work of the human beings. However, God has united between the two elevations for us, one of which is height of place through work and the other the height of position and rank through knowledge, and we are of those who are heightened and God is with us in this heightening with the heightening of the Uniqueness of the Ipseity.

Then He said, transcending from association (*ishtirāk*) through togetherness: 'Glorify the Name of your Lord the Most High' from any meaning of association in this. In other words, when God established His being with us for His *huwiyya* through His words: '. . . and God is with you' and caused the ambiguity of the conjecture of association with Him in this height, to remove this ambiguity and possible conjecture He said: 'Glorify the Name of your Lord the Most High.' In other words, when God established for us the being together in this

height with Him, to transcend from association in this height He said: 'Glorify the Name of your Lord the Most High', by which He meant: glorify the Name of your Lord which is higher than the meaning of this association. Thus God established another height for His own Ipseity beyond the height wherein He is associated with us, and transcended Himself from this association. This is because there is no end to the degrees of height and perfection because even though there is established for us a height because we have united between the two heights, yet between the two heights our collecting together is a relative collection whereas for God there results between the collectivity of places and the height of places a totality of the totals because God is the same as the total, and in another aspect the height of God is the essential height because He is High absolutely by His own Ipseity, not through relationship to other. Consequently, all height which is related to everything is the height of God because the height which is manifested and the height which is related to Him in everything is to the degree of God's revealing Himself therein by the Name 'Most High'. Consequently, in original height He has no associate.

And what an extraordinary thing from the orders of immanence that Man is the highest of the existents, that is to say, the Perfect Man, but that there is no relationship of height for him except through following, be it by place or be it by position, and these are places of descent (of station), and he has no height by himself and he is high either by the height of place or by the height of position, and the height is due to them. That is to say, it is of the most wondrous of orders that Man, that is, the Perfect Man, should be the highest of existents. That is to say, the Perfect Man is the most high of existents, but the fact is that there is no height related to him except through following either through height of place or through height of position, yet position is a status, a place of descent. Consequently, the Perfect Man's height is not intrinsic to him, that is, he is high by height of place and height of position. Yet height of place and position is established. That is to say, although the Perfect Man is the highest of existents there is no height related to him except by following through place and position since height is established for both of these. Consequently, there is no essential height for the Perfect Man.

If there is no essential height for Man who is the highest of existents, how can there be an essential height for any other existent than him? Thus, that height by which place and position have been qualified (as in the words): ‘High place, and you are the heightened ones’ is due to being together with God. There is no essential height established for him because there is no height for the relative except with God for whom absolute essential height is established. In this consideration it is also possible to say that while Perfect Man is the highest of existents there is no height related to him except by following a place or a position. Consequently, his height is not essential to him. However, for that person who has height essentially by himself, then he is high through the height of place and the height of position, because height is established for place and position.

For this aspect the Shaykh finds corroboration in the words: And the height of place is like: ‘The Compassionate (*rahmān*) is equable over the Throne’ and this is the very highest of places, and the height of position is: Everything is annihilated except His face, and to Him returns all order. Is there a divinity together with God? This means that the height of place is exactly the same as: ‘The Compassionate (*rahmān*) is equable over the Throne’, and the Throne is the very highest of places because God has revealed Himself to it through the Name Compassionate (*rahmān*) and became equable over it with the Light of being. Consequently the establishment of the height of place for God is by virtue of the equability and revelation of the Name Compassionate (*rahmān*) over the Throne. As for the height of position, it is: ‘Everything is annihilated except His face’ and ‘to Him returns all order’ and ‘is there a divinity together with God?’ Which means that the establishment of the height of position for God is through the verset: ‘Everything is annihilated except His face’, which means that since everything other than His face is annihilated, the reality and the ipseity of a thing exists by its face and that face is the Being of the Absolute God. Consequently, everything passes away and is annihilated and what remains and persists forever is God with His own Ipseity, and as all orders pass away in God, that is to say, their *ta’ayyun* passes away, then they return to Him, because that which is particularized, having been released from the condition of

being particularized, becomes exactly the same as non-particularized. As for: 'Is there a divinity together with God?', this means that there is not. Consequently, there is no being for any other.

Now, the particularization of all things is annihilatable and all aspects return to Him. Consequently, the essential height and the real face is established for One which is heightened in Its own Ipseity. And when God said: 'And We have elevated him to a high place' He brought about the word 'high' as a laudatory qualificative for the 'place', and when He said: 'And when your Lord said to the angels: "I am bringing about a Viceregent on earth"', this is the height of position. This points out what we already know, that the height of place and position is not an essential height, and here again we see and know definitely that by the laudatory qualification of 'place' by the word 'high', and equally when He says: 'I am bringing about a Viceregent upon earth', that this degree of viceregency is the height of position, that in the height of place and in the height of position of Man is not an essential height because He qualifies the place by the word 'high', and height becomes a qualificative of the place and not of the person, and that man becomes high by being elevated to that place, and for position it is the same thing because He has reserved the height of position for the degree of viceregency. This means that the height of position which is particular to the Perfect Man is the height of the degree of viceregency which is the degree of collectivity of singularity of perfection and completeness. Equally then, this height is a brought-about height for the Perfect Man and it is not essential. And He said to the angels: 'You have aggrandized yourselves, or are you of the high ones?', meaning by this the high ones who are a variety of angels for whom is established the height of position by God because of their being in love and being unaware of anything else and by virtue of which they were not ordered to prostrate to Adam, because, due to the extreme force of their love, they do not even know their own *nafs* and they do not even know that God has created Adam. Consequently, for these angels God established height of position and said to Iblis concerning the high angels: 'Did you find yourself too grand to prostrate yourself before what I have created with both My Hands and have you become one of the high

angels who are not ordered with prostration to Adam?' And He brought the height for the angels. Had this been because they were angels, all the angels would have been included in this height, and when this was not generalized for all of them to take part in at the level of the angels we knew that this height was with God the height of position. Thus when God establishes height for the angels it is not because they are angels that they are at that height, because had that been so, all angels would have been included in that position, but as the order of height is not generalized to all angels with the being of association of all angels at that level the reality became known to us that this height at the level of God is the height of position. In other words, this is the height of the degree of being drowned in love in the Being of God. Thus, even their height is not essential to them but it is a height of qualification and degree and this has been specialized for the high angels. They were existent in association in the angels of *rahmān* in the height of position, but the angels of *rahmān* were ordered with prostration and these were not ordered with prostration because of their being drowned in love in God. Consequently, it is for them that the height of position is established. And it is the same way for the Viceregents from among men. Their height through being Viceregent is not an essential height. Had it been otherwise it would have been for all men and as this is not general we have known that in this height the height is for position, which means that the Viceregents from among men are also like the high angels. Had their height because of their viceregency been an essential height, since they are human beings this height would have been resultant for every person, but since this height is not generalized for every person it is known to us that the height of the Viceregents is specifically for the position, that is, for their degree, and that degree is the degree of viceregency which collects and contains the totality of the Divine Names and qualifications of necessarily-so-ness of Reality and equally collects all the relationships of immanence and the qualifications of creatural possibilities. This is why the Viceregent which is particularized at that degree is manifest with the image of God, together with the image of the universe. Consequently, whether it be the height established for the high angels or whether it be the height resultant for the human

Viceregents, they are equally the height of position. That is to say, they are the height of a degree and they are brought-about height and qualificative height and they are not the essential height. The essential height and real height is established only for the *ḥaqq* who is High by His own Ipseity. Thus, the height of the *ḥaqq* is differentiated from the height of position in which all others participate in meaning.

The Shaykh, may God be pleased with him, after having exposed that whether it be the height of place or position of that which is other than God it is qualificative and relative, he starts expounding on the essential height of the *ḥaqq*. And of the Beautiful Names the Name High (*'aliyy*), and the Name *'aliyy* is of the Beautiful Names of the *ḥaqq*. High as compared to what and there is no other than Him with Him? Then He is indeed High by His own Ipseity. Here the interrogative form is for the purpose of denying that there can be such a situation. In certain copies this is even given as 'higher than what?' All this is to denote that there is not anybody else to be higher, and height is of God's own Ipseity. That is to say, God's height is not in relationship to the immanence or the creatural multiplicity and it is neither a qualification nor a relationship, but in Reality, where there is no other than Himself, He is High by His own Self. That is to say, a height which is essential and not high by qualification or meaning. Or from what thing? And from what thing is He higher? There is nothing except Him and this height is by His own Being. Since that thing from which He might be higher is no other than the *ḥuwiyya* of God, consequently God's height happens for His own *nafs* which is Rich beyond Need (*ghaniyy*) from other by His own Reality, because He is the same as the totality of all things. The height is mentioned as being higher from, but that is because it includes the meaning of elevation in it and it is mentioned with great height because there is the meaning of surpassing and dominating. However, the height of God is not through attribution so that there could be any inclusion of highness or from-ness since His height is essential and He is High by His own Ipseity. And with respect to being He is the same as all beings, and things which are named as latter things are high by their essence. And God, by virtue of being, is the same as the things that are, because there is no other existence other than His Being.

However, the things which are called latter things are high by themselves because that which is high by its essence is the same as the Being of God. However, in considering that God is the same as the things there is a difference between the height which is established for that and the height of the Absolute Ipseity. By virtue of the fact that God is the same as the totality of things, the height that is established for them is that His height is manifest in the image of all things by His Names, and that it includes all images of things, and the height of His Absolute Ipseity is due to the fact that He is higher than the plurality of Names because the Divine Names which are only essential relationships are in annihilation in the Uniqueness of the Ipseity. And nevertheless there is no other than Him and He is High and it is not a height of qualification. It is true that the latter things are no other than the *huwiyya* of God, and by consideration of God being the same as all existents the height is through His Essential height, not by qualification, whereas the existents, by consideration of being other than God, are high by qualification of place and position and not through their own ipseity. And those *a'yān*, for them there is non-existence and they are established therein and they have not even smelt the scent of existence. That is to say, the latter things are also the *huwiyya* of God, and the word 'fixed' or 'established' is a qualification for the *a'yān*, and the word 'therein' refers to non-existence. However, it can also refer to God, because these *a'yān*, which are in the non-existence and are established and fixed therein and have not smelt the scent or breath of existence, are established in the non-existence of God, and the things that exist and are latter are manifest due to the Divine revelations in the mirrors of the *a'yān* which are established in the non-being, consequently becoming visible images. And they are always in their state, which means that the *a'yān* are still established according to their state which is His Essential non-existence, and that which is individuated (*muta'ayyin*) in the images of the *a'yān* is the Being of the *ḥaqq* because the ipseities of the *a'yān* do not necessitate any other thing than non-being ('*adam*'). With their multitude of images in existence, whereas the '*ayn* is One of all that is collected in the collectivity, and the existence of plurality is in the Names and they are the relationships and they are the orders of non-existence, and there is

not other than the *'ayn* and that is the Ipseity, and He is High by His own Being and not by qualification. That is to say, the *a'yān* are established according to their original non-being with multiplicity of images in existence. Nevertheless, that which is manifest in the totality of existence is the *'ayn* which is individuated in the totality of existences, and it is still the same One which by virtue of non-existence of the *a'yān* is individuated and has become several by manifesting with the images of existence. Consequently, the existence of multiplicity is in the Names, and the Names are relationships and the relationships are orders of non-being. Consequently, there is no other in existence than the Ipseity which is the One *'ayn*. Thus, God is High by His own Being, and His height is essential and not qualificative. In other words, the images of existences are individuated and manifested through the revelation of the One Ipseity which is the One *'ayn* reflected in the mirrors of the established *a'yān*. Consequently, the *a'yān* are still in non-being, and that which is manifest in the mirrors of the established *a'yān* is the One *'ayn* which is revealed in the images of existence and which is manifest in each *'ayn* by virtue of place. Consequently, He is High by His own Ipseity in all images. The word 'with' at the beginning of the Arabic sentence refers to the word 'established' which refers to the sentence: 'And they are always in their state.' By virtue of this there is no height by qualification in the universe; however, there are superior aspects of being. By virtue of what has been said before there is no height of attribution in the universe. All height is essential because the images which are numerous in existence are only the revelations and manifestations of the One Existent in the mirrors of non-existent *a'yān*. Consequently, that which is manifested in all images is no other than the One Being, but Its places of manifestation which are manifested by virtue of the non-existent *a'yān*, which are the aspects of being, are qualified existents and these are one superior to the other. And the height of attribution exists in the One *'ayn* only due to Its multiple aspects. Because of this it is said in this matter, He and not He, and you and not you. Height of attribution exists in the One *'ayn* by virtue of Its many aspects because these aspects are one superior to the other, just as the essential height exists in the existents by virtue of the *ḥaqq* being the

same as the existents. Because of this, we say concerning the universe that in consideration of its reality the universe is the *ḥaqq* because the Being of the *ḥaqq* is the same as all things, and due to the limitation of the particularization the universe is not the *ḥaqq*, and in the same way, due to the image we say you, and due to the Reality we say not you. When the manifestation of One Being in all beings is considered the *'ayn* is the total *'ayn*, manifestedly and interiorly. Consequently, it is said, He and not you. But due to the One Being and the non-existent *a'yān* being individuated and manifest through different images and by virtue of the non-brought-about aptitude of the *a'yān*, and when the fact that they are relative and branched and coloured is considered, it is said not He, and you, because the relative being is not the same as the Absolute in the totality of aspects. That is why by virtue of Its many aspects there is height of attribution in the One *'ayn*.

Al-Kharraz said, and he is an aspect from the aspects of the *ḥaqq* and a tongue from among the tongues, talking from his own *nafs*, that one cannot know God except by combining between the opposites, in the determination over them by them. Abu Sa'id Kharraz, God have mercy over him, said, and Kharraz who is an aspect of the *ḥaqq* from among His aspects and who is a tongue from among His tongues speaks from his own self, in fact it is not possible to know God except by combining Him between the opposites and determining over Him by the opposites. They asked Abu Sa'id Kharraz: 'How did you know God the Most High?' As he was the image of the *ḥaqq* which united the opposites he answered: 'By uniting between the opposites.' That is to say, by uniting Him between the opposites. That is to say, by determining over Him with the opposites and uniting Him, because the Divine *kuwiyya* is the singularity of the collectivity of the totality of the antinomic complementary Names and Qualities of opposition. Consequently, of the many-formed realities and complementary things, nothing is His opposite. Rather that He is the collector of all opposites by His collectivity of uniqueness. Thus, the *ḥaqq* is known by the collectivity of all opposites, which makes it that He is determined upon by the collectivity of opposites.

That Kharraz spoke from his own *nafs* is according to two aspects.

One aspect is this, that Kharraz was qualified with the Divine Qualities of opposition, and observing the Qualities of opposition in his own self he determines over the *ḥaqq* through the oppositions. And the other aspect is this: as Kharraz is one of the aspects of the Divine aspects and a tongue from among the tongues of the *ḥaqq*, by uniting God the High between the two opposites, in the tongue of the place of manifestation that he is he determines with them over his own *nafs*. And the words: 'talking from his own *nafs*' become understandable as a substitute for the words 'Kharraz said', that is to say, Kharraz said he was speaking from his own *nafs*.

He is the First and the Last and the Manifest and the Hidden, and He is the same as that which is manifest and the same as that which is hidden, and in His state of manifestation there is not anybody other who can see Him and there is not anybody from whom He can be the hidden. He is manifest to His Self and He is hidden from Himself, and He is the one called Abu Sa'id al-Kharraz and others like that from the Names of latter things. (And in certain copies 'and others' occurs.) Thus God is the First and the Last and the Manifest and the Hidden. Consequently, God is the same as the thing that is manifested, and again God is the same as a thing that is hidden. When He is in a state of manifestation there is not one thing other than Him in existence that could see Him when He is manifest, which means that in the manifest there is nothing other than Him in existence and there is not one in existence from whom the *ḥaqq* can be hidden. Thus, the *ḥaqq* is manifested to His own Self and hidden from His own Self. That is to say, when the *ḥaqq* is manifested He is manifested to His own Self and His own Self observes Him, and when He is hidden it is again His Self who is hidden from His Self who is manifest. That is to say, in His Being which is individuated in the images of existence He is hidden by virtue of His non-being and absoluteness. That which is called Abu Sa'id al-Kharraz, and with it all others of the latter Names, is the *ḥaqq*. That is to say, He becomes hidden by virtue of Reality, and He is an aspect from among the Divine aspects by virtue of individuation and there is not in existence one which is other than Him. There is only this much, that the aspects are one superior to the other and various by virtue of the Names being manifest in them or

hidden in them, and because the determinations of necessarily-so-ness and the determinations of possibilities are one predominant over the other, and because there is a predominance of oneness in some and plurality in others, and spirituality in some and corporeality in others.

The Hidden says 'No' when the Manifest says 'I', and the Manifest says 'No' when the Hidden says 'I', and this is in every opposition, but the speaker is the same one, and He is the same as the hearer. Here the Shaykh, may God be pleased with him, says in this that by consideration of aspects interior is the opposite of the manifest, and manifest is the opposite of the hidden. That is to say, the Interior says 'No' if the Manifest says 'I', and the Manifest equally says 'No' when the Hidden says 'I', because the determination of the manifest is in opposition to the hidden, and the order of the hidden is completely different to the manifest. The manifest is plurality and the hidden is oneness. Thus, when the manifest manifests itself with its plurality, the hidden with its oneness is in opposition to it, and when the hidden manifests its oneness, the manifest opposes it by its plurality, and this opposition is established in all oppositions. Yet, the speaker is the same one in both the manifest and the interior and in all that is in opposition, and the speaker is the same as the hearer, thus it is the same thing which is the speaker and the hearer and the manifest and the hidden, but only in the aspects by virtue of variety are they the opposite of one another. Consequently, that it is the same thing that is the speaker and the hearer is observed by the Shaykh, may God be pleased with him, through the words of the Prophet (S.A.). The Prophet, peace be upon him, said: 'God forgave my people the vicissitudes (unfortunate occurrences) caused by their *nafs* which have not come about through speech or action.' This *ḥadīth* concerns the pardon of the people of Mohammed, peace be on him, by which all the shortcomings which emanated from their interior strength and manifested through their bodily members were pardoned. That is to say, the Prophet (S.A.) says: God the High went even further than the shortcomings of my people and pardoned even the things that they brought into occurrence through their *nafs*, which shortcomings did not emanate from them either through speech or work or action.

The vicissitude occurring in this case is from the *nafs*, wherein the *nafs* addresses a person with an order with its mention and connections, and the dissuader from it forbids him from its action, and in the action at the level of hesitation the *nafs* knows the differences of the predications. And the *nafs* causes to occur its own occurrences and hears it, and knows by what (cause) it has itself brought about this occurrence or vicissitude. Thus the *nafs* knows what thing brought about this vicissitude and occurrence and what thing ordered it, and each person's *nafs*, when this occurrence is suggested, hears that occurrence being suggested and knows what thing has brought about this occurrence.

The 'ayn is One, and if the predications are various there is no way or line of conduct permitting of ignorance in things similar to this because Man knows all this from his own *nafs*. But the state is that the 'ayn is One, and even if it is true that the predications are varied there is no way or line of conduct permitting of ignorance in things similar to this, because the man knows from his own *nafs* that his *nafs* is the one that causes these occurrences and hears what these occurrences say to him, and knows it, and there is no way or line of conduct permitting of ignorance in this. Thus Man is one 'ayn with his *nafs* and is multiple and several by the predications of the *nafs*. Consequently, as the predications of the *nafs* are varied and in complementary opposition (to one another), its gnosis is resultant from combining between the varied predications. And he is the image of God. Man is the image of God, and God with His Ipseity is One. With relationships and qualifications of complementaries and Names and opposing qualifications He is many. Consequently, this gnosis results from the combining between the opposites. The orders became mingled, and the numbers became manifest with one in the known degrees, and the one brought about the numbers and the numbers articulated the one, and the predication of the numbers did not manifest except by the numbered. This is to say, the One 'ayn became many through the particularizations (*ta'ayyunāt*) and became several through the degrees, and thus became the varied orders, and in the known degrees numbers became manifest with the one. Now, the manifestation of the numbers with one in the known degrees is

this, that the one is one in its first degree, and in its second degree it is ten, and in its third degree it is a hundred, and in its fourth degree it is a thousand. Of these degrees each degree is a degree of totality, which carry in them the ones and the extensions of their countings. For instance, like the kinds that include the individuals and the genres which include the kinds. Thus, when the one in the first degree reveals itself in a latter image it is called 'two', and the two with the one is one in total. One is not a number. The collective body is one, and the collectivity which is called 'two' is also number one. Thus, image is one and matter is also one and the total is also one which reveals itself in the form of many. Thus, one brought into existence the numbers by revealing itself in both images. The triple is also in the same way. Unique and one is one, and its predication in oneness is the same as its predication in two. The levelling and the augmenting in the level of the one and the predications of the particularizations in the first degree are also like this. If one revealed itself in the second degree it is called 'ten', and ten is equally one, image-wise, matter-wise and totality-wise. Thus with all its totality of degrees of numbers and with all the names of numbers and with the images of numbers and with the degrees of revelation, one is named. Thus, one is two by virtue of being one number and it is the second of the (number) two. In the same way, one is three by virtue of being one number and it is the third of the three, and in the same way it is four and the fourth of the four. God has said: 'There is not a collection of three where He is not the fourth, or a five where He is not the sixth, and further down like this or many more without He being with them' (Quran). Thus, one brings into being number, and number articulates the one. Whenever you articulate the number at the level of analysis and verification in your images of particularizations and in the degrees of revelation you will find no other thing than the one which is revealed, and when number became the relationship of particularizations which is added on to the one in its revelations and in its particularizations, then number becomes particularized by that which is numbered and even that is really one, other than which there is no thing which is real, and enumeration and particularization and revelation, and non-enumeration and non-particularization and non-revelation, are made real by it.

Consequently, if God revealed Himself in the image of His Essential Uniqueness, there would result the degree of: 'There was God and with Him there was nothing', and numbers of Names and the infinite Qualities would become therein hidden, and this is like the hiddenness and interiority of halfness, one-thirdness, one-fourthness and other infinite numerical relationships within the one, because these do not manifest except through number; however they are differentiated by number. If God reveals Himself in the images of particularizations and the degrees of revelations, He reveals number and plurality and brings into emergence couplings and singularities. Consequently, according to this consideration these images of particularizations are the degrees of descent of the Being of the One God. And what is there in existence except Him?

Among the numbered there are some which are (of) non-existence and some which are (of) existence. That is to say, some of the numbered become inexistent in the exterior and some become existent because the absolute non-existent with the 'ayn in the unknowable is non-existent and it has no existence in the exterior and in appertenance. It sometimes happens that something is inexistent by virtue of the senses but it is existent by virtue of the intelligence. It is inevitable that it be either from number or from the numbered. Thus it is possible that sometimes a thing is from the point of view of the senses inexistent, yet it is existent from the point of view of intellect, for instance, like the half or the third or other relationships existing in one, and if it is considered from the point of view of the intellect, these are inexistent in the exterior but existent in the intellect. It sometimes happens that one is at the same time inexistent and existent in the exterior, just like Zayd is existent at home and non-existent in the market, and consequently it is inevitable that the number and the numbered be either in the exterior or in the intellect. It is inevitable that there should be an emergence building up from one. That (number) one emerges by its own cause. Thus, it is inevitable that one should originate and bring about number. Consequently, number becomes what comes out and is manifest because of one.

Each of the numbers happens to be a reality by itself, like the number nine for example, and ten and the ones below it, and all

those more *ad infinitum*. Even if each of the degrees of the degrees of numbers is one degree of reality where that degree is differentiated from another degree by that reality, like nine and ten, or down from nine until two, or *ad infinitum* to much more above ten, yet that one particular reality of a degree is not the total of degrees. It is not a collection, because collection is association whereas the totality of degrees are varied realities and each degree is differentiated from another degree by its own reality. Consequently, the words: 'It is not a collection' becomes in qualification of the reality. (In some copies it is even referred to as: In fact in each degree.) And the name 'totality of ones' does not become detached from it, which means that also the name 'totality of ones' does not become detached from each of the degrees which are equally one reality when the total is not ones. In fact, the two is one reality, three is also one reality. You have attained to what these degrees have attained to, that they are each a one and that of them that which is one 'ayn is not the same thing as that which persists in them. In fact, degree is one reality. Two is a single reality, equally three is a single reality. This is so, you have attained to that thing to which these degrees have attained, that if from the numbers each degree has become a single reality it is by virtue of its being a numerical reality, and of them each 'ayn is not the same thing as what persists in them of the a'yān and that each degree is differentiated from other degrees by its own reality. For instance, two, which is a single reality, is differentiated from three which is another single reality, because two is composed of two ones and three is composed of three ones. Each reality then does not become the same as the other reality even though the name 'totality of ones' is not detached from them, because two totals two ones, and three totals three ones. Consequently, in accordance with this, and the total holds them all. Thus the totality of ones holds the totality of the degrees of numbers and is true to the totality of numbers, like the genus is true to the species, for instance, like the veracity of animal in the case of both Man and horse. And we say from there of it. Thus the singularity of each degree which is one reality, we say from that degree that that degree is a collective differentiation from the differentiations of ones and is a particular body of collectivity, that is to say, it is an image of

species through which it is differentiated from all other degrees. And we determine upon them by it. Of the degrees of numbers we determine upon them with the uniqueness of each degree which is also of one reality. For instance, we say with the uniqueness of the reality of the two that the two is of one and one in its reality, which means that the reality of two, which is particularized from one with one, is according to the reality of uniqueness and we determine over it with oneness because the reality is one, and other degrees are like this. In other words, as the name 'totality of ones' is not removed from the realities of the degrees of numbers, consequently all the numbers are like genres for the realities. It collects them and takes them and is devolved into all of them and is true over all their collectivity, like the veracity of genus over all its species. Thus, the totality of ones speaks from the reality of its totality through those degrees and it determines over them with that reality, which means that whatever is necessary for a degree the totality of ones bestows that and determines over that degree by that which it has bestowed. In other words, the totality of ones is conversant with each degree from among all the degrees with its totality of reality from that same degree. That is to say, it is determinant over each degree with the determination that that degree has bestowed upon it, which is what that degree necessitates. Indeed, in this saying, twenty degrees became apparent. To explain this by an example, from one to nine the degrees are ones. After that comes ten and twenty which are the names of special decades, and then the thirties, forties, fifties, sixties, seventies, eighties, and the nineties and the hundreds and a thousand. Thus, of these twenty degrees, for each degree there is a reality established which is different from the other reality which is form of species. The name 'totality of ones' is prevalent for all the degrees of numbers and all the degrees are associated in it except the one, because in the one there is no combination and one is not a number and for it there is a special degree in existence which is that it is the origin and point of emergence of all numbers. Indeed, we enter combinations. Thus, to recapitulate, combination does enter into all the degrees of numbers which are of twenty degrees. And the name 'totality of ones' is true of all of them, and for each degree of the degrees of numbers there is established a reality by

which it is differentiated from another reality, and all the degrees, although they are one in consideration of the name 'totality of ones' being prevalent over them, they are not however one 'ayn, as for example two which is not the same as the *a'yān* which remain over from the degrees of the *a'yān* of numbers because with the repetition of one once it is differentiated from the *a'yān* of numbers, and the other degrees are also like this. In short, one is not of the degrees of numbers. It is announced by virtue of its being the origin of numbers. It is because of this that the Shaykh said in fact: 'Indeed, combination does enter', but he did not say that all the degrees are combinations. Under this consideration there is a distinction which results from the words 'the degrees are twenty'. Another aspect of this is that the Shaykh, may God be pleased with him, proverbializes what it intends by saying: 'Indeed, in this saying, twenty degrees became apparent.' In other words, if there happen to be twenty degrees in these words, then the reality of the totality of uniqueness becomes manifested from this twenty which is composed of ones, and if this reality happens to be the singularity of the totality of the particularized ones and if it is resultant from particularized ones, yet it still is a single reality, and by virtue of being the manifested named, it is one in this particularization of the collectivity of this assembly. Thus, when twenty is manifest in the degrees of tens, then it is the name of the reality of oneness of the collectivity of the assembly, just like the Name Knowledge.

And the 'mothers' of the degrees of numbers are four, and there is no end to the extension of their relative combinations. When we say: 'Indeed, combination does enter', that is to say, when we say 'twenty degrees'; then we say in the reality of the degree of one that it is twenty and that it is composed of twenty degrees. Thus, this one degree which is called 'twenty' bears the extensions of its own reality which are the extensions of numbers from one until twenty. Consequently, if we point at the reality of twentyness (of being twenty) we say it is a single reality because it is not the same as the *a'yān* and the realities persisting from the degrees of numbers, because the persisting degrees of numbers we name with another than twenty. For instance, the degrees of numbers which are below the twenty, like nineteen, eighteen and seventeen, until you come to one, and all the degrees of numbers

which are above the twenty, like thirty or forty, are each named with another proper name other than the decan of the twenties, and of the realities of numbers each reality is a unit in itself, and it becomes absolutely clarified with your saying 'twenty' that the reality of the singularity of the totality which is known as twenty, even though it is a single degree from the degrees of numbers, yet its oneness is a oneness of collectivity because by virtue of its being one and unique it cannot be added and is not resultant from some ones. Consequently, of these decans, each decan and each reality from the reality of numbers is taken up in the name 'collectivity of ones' and in which they are all in association, and combination enters into all of them and they are differentiated one from the other by it. Under this consideration, in the words 'twenty degrees', the word 'degrees', which belongs to the word 'twenty', becomes the activator of the words 'become apparent', and from this there results a state. You are not detached from establishing the same thing which is, in your consideration, negative in itself. Thus, at your level you have not been separated from establishing the same thing as that which is in itself negative. That is to say, each degree of the degrees of numbers is distinct one from the other by its reality, and the determination which is established for one is negated from the other. Nevertheless, by virtue of each of them being a single reality and a single degree and by consideration that the name 'collectivity of ones' includes them all, each reality from among the realities becomes the same as the reality of the other. For instance, we can say that one is different to the remainder of numbers because they are numbers and one is not a number because it is the origin of number. For other numbers we can say each of them is a number and for each of them there is the reality of species which is different from another reality, because two is a species and it is different from the threes and fours and other numbers. Three is also like this. Yet, equally, we can say for these numbers that they are a collectivity of ones. Thus, according to this consideration they become one the same as the other. Consequently, even though each degree is by the reality of differentiation other than another, and that it should be the same as another is negatable by itself at your level, yet you prove that it is the same thing in consideration of the

collectivity of ones. Through another consideration this proposition of the Shaykh, God be pleased with him, means that if you say 'twenty' you establish the number and you negate the oneness, and if while you consider the reality and the degree you say 'twenty', then you establish the uniqueness of the reality of the particularized decan and you negate number, because the reality of singularity or the degree or the state of being a decan does not therein depend on its mentation as a number. Consequently, in accordance with this, you are not detached from negating the thing that you have established and from establishing the thing you have negated because of the combination of the two aspects. A number which is borne by the reality of one decan from among decans and numbers negates from the singularity of that reality by virtue of the fact that that reality is a particularized collectivity. In the same way, you establish in each particularized decan one singularity which negates it from number. In fact, when you particularize it in this way you have in fact particularized the one decan over and apart from all the collectivity of numbers. Thus that decan becomes a one and bears in it the onenesses of the infinity of particularized numerous decans, and because it is a particularized decan infinity does not enter into it, and because of the consideration that the oneness is essentially the origin for all the decans particularized above it or below it, it thereby includes all the decans. He who knows what we have decided concerning the numbers, that if he negates it it is the same as if he establishes it. Now, if a person concerning the numbers knows the thing we have considered here, that in fact the negation of the *a'yān* is the same as establishing them, that is to say, if he knows that one is from whence emanate the numbers which are differentiated in the numerous different degrees with all their particularizations and revelations, then one is called with the name 'many' by virtue of the fact of the enumeration of the revelations and particularizations in the degrees of the manifested. Thus, enumeration is the qualification of one with regard to its particularization in the degrees of things and not by virtue of the consideration of its reality as one. Each multiplicity is one by virtue of the oneness of the particularization of the one reality and it is not one by virtue of composition, and to negate oneness from each number is to establish

numerality for it because number is one reality from among many numbers, thus one encompasses the beginning and the last of the numbers, and to negate the collectivity from number which is its becoming many is to establish for it the collectivity. Each number according to one consideration is different to another, and according to another consideration it is the same as the other. He will indeed know that God who is transcendent is He who is the immanent (*tashbīh*) creation (*khalq*). God, who is transcendent from immanence by consideration of the Reality of His Singularity, is the same as the immanental creation in consideration of His revelations in the particularized images. Thus it is God who administrates (*nāzir*) the Reality of Singularity which is revealed in the images of revelation and particularization, and it is the *khalq* which administrates pluralization and multiplicity of numbers by virtue of degrees, but the verifier we mentioned, according to the Mohammedian taste at once says it is *ḥaqq* by virtue of its reality and it is immanence (*khalq*) by virtue of the particularity which requires plurality. Indeed, it is (absolutely, in the superlative case,) so, that the created (*khalq*) is differentiated from the Creator (*khāliq*), since as the creation is creation it is not the creator, and the creator by virtue of being the creator is not the created, and this distinction between creatorhood and createdness is apparent exactly as oneness is distinguished from plurality, and singularity from multiplicity, but the *'ayn* which is in the singular and the multiple and the one and the plural is the same *'ayn*. One is of the glory (*sha'n*) of God, uniquely, really, and by His particularization and manifestation, plurally and creaturely. The gnostic, Abu Hassan al-Ghowsry, said: 'Praise and glory to Him who has made Himself subtle and called Himself *ḥaqq* and then intensified Himself and named Himself *khalq*.' And the order is such that the Creator is He who is the created, and the order is such that the created is He who is the Creator. The glory of the order is that in the first case it is through the aspect of particularization and manifestation that the creator is the created, and the glory of the order is that through the aspect of reality it is the created that is equally the creator. According to the two considerations, and in complementary opposition (in reflection of one to the other), He is this and this is He, but as the One Being of

the *ḥaqq* in the first degree is qualified with creatorness in action and effect, and He is qualified with creaturality by being manifest, particularized and individuated in the latter degree of being receptor of the action and effect, the Shaykh, God be pleased with him, said: All this is from One Essence (*'ayn*). He means that the creator and the created are all from the same *'ayn*. That is to say, the totality of manifestation and particularization, together with the qualities of creaturality and creatorness, 'are all from one and the same *'ayn* which is the degree of Singularity and the Ipseity of Divinity as the origin of all qualities, but there is at the same time a difference between the One *'ayn* and the qualities of being a creator or a creature which are particularized from that *'ayn*. Perhaps, rather, it is not from One *'ayn*, but rather that it is many *'uyūn*, which would come to mean that the Being which is particularized in the creator and the creature is by virtue of degrees not from One *'ayn* but perhaps rather that Being is One *'ayn* in consideration of the fact of the Reality of Oneness of Divinity and that that Being is many *'uyūn* in the numerous degrees and in the multiplicity of the places of manifestation in consideration of His particularizations and manifestation. For instance, all numbers emanate from one which is one *'ayn*, perhaps even that all of them are the same as the one in consideration of the reality and summarization (*ijmāl*), and then again the one is the many *'uyūn* which are particularized in numerous degrees in consideration of manifestation and detailing (*tafṣīl*).

Praise be to Him who has shown His humanity (*nāsūt*)
 And made us to become impotent of His penetrating
 Divinity (*lāhūt*),
 Then He began His manifest creation
 In the images of eating and drinking.

Thus, the One Being is many with Its particularizations, and in reality the many particularizations are One Being. The Shaykh, may God be pleased with him, having declaimed this, proceeds to explain it with the story of Abraham and said: And look, what do you see? He said: 'Oh my father, do what you have been ordered to do.' The One Being which is particularized in one place of manifestation addresses

either Isaac or Ishmael which are the other (latter) *ta'ayyun*, but instead he saw that he was immolating his own *nafs*, and in the universe of senses he did not sacrifice the grand sacrifice by immolation except that he sacrificed his own *nafs*. Consequently, the One Being of God, which is One Reality, is manifest and particularized in numerous degrees and multitudinous particularizations, and in each degree and particularization He is called by a Name and He is particularized with one particularization wherein He is not particularized in another particularization and in another degree with that same Name, yet, by virtue of reality it is the same *'ayn*. Thus, the one who saw himself in the image of Abraham and was therein particularized and saw he was immolating his son is again his own *nafs* which he saw in the particularization of his son which is his own being which is manifested and was immolated in the image of the great immolation. And he who is called Adam and who is a spouse by virtue of particularization marries his own *nafs* which appears in the image and in the particularization of his consort. Here the Shaykh, God be pleased with him, by mentioning: 'And He created from him his pair', refers to a Qurznic *āya* which reads: 'Oh you people, be devout to your Lord who has created you from one *nafs* and from it its couple and from them deployed many men and women', because this *āya* also points to the fact that the One *'ayn*, being particularized in different degrees, manifests as many *'uyūn*, and that the many *'uyūn* by virtue of their reality are only one *'ayn*. Thus He created from one *nafs* its couple. And he did not marry other than his own *nafs* from whence was his mistress and his son, and the order is one in numbers. Thus, Adam did not marry anything other than his *nafs*. Thus his mistress was created from his own *nafs*, and the son of Abraham was also established from his own *nafs*. Consequently, Adam marries his own *nafs* in the image of his mate and Abraham immolates his own self in the image of his son, and even in the image of the ram he sacrifices his own *nafs*, and the order of being in reality is one in the images of numbers; even though by virtue of particularization it is multiple in particularizations of species and persons, yet the unity of the *'ayn* unites the plurality of all particularizations. Look now how you see unity as the 'mother' of plurality, or do you see unity veiled by plurality, or do

you see plurality annihilated in unity, or do you see unity as an aspect and do you see plurality as an aspect?

Now, let it be known like this, that Nature is the manifest state of Divinity, and Divinity is the interior state of Nature, and Nature is in the degree of feminine receptivity for the effects of the Divine Names, and it is in it, that is, Nature, that all the images of immanence of being of effectedness are manifested, perhaps even that the Divine Names, together with the Breath of *rahīmān*, are therein particularized. Thus, Nature is one reality which is an intelligible existent which, while it includes the four opposing realities, is manifested with multiple determinations and is at the same time the same as all that as it is established according to the intelligible reality of oneness for the One Being of God, which by virtue of particularization is manifest in multiple *'uyūn* whereas by virtue of its reality it still is one *'ayn*. And to establish again its oneness, the Shaykh said: What is Nature and what is manifest from it? He asks, thus that thing which is named by the word Nature, what is it? And that thing which is manifested from Nature, what is that? All this means that while Nature is the manifestation of Divinity, which is one reality, all those that contain the opposing modalities which are the forms of Nature manifest from it by virtue of numerous particularizations. Consequently, Nature and all the natural bodies which manifest from it, though one *'ayn* by virtue of reality, become multiple *'uyūn* by virtue of particularization, and Nature and the images which manifest from it are, by virtue of reality, the Reality of the *ḥaqq* which is the Unique *'ayn*. We have not seen it diminished by what manifests from it, nor increased by that which it does not manifest. We did not see that Nature diminished with that thing that manifested from it, also nor did we see it increase by its not manifesting. This is because Nature is total and does not accept increase or diminishing because total realities are Divine words and there is no change in them. And that which has manifested from it is not other than itself. And the thing which manifests from Nature is nothing other than itself by virtue of reality. Thus, what manifests from Nature is no other than itself, Nature, by virtue of reality, and that which has manifested in Nature is the images of Nature. And it is not the same as that which is manifested from it because of the

his particularization in the place of manifestation of the son. That is to say, and he said: 'And look, what do you see?' Thus the Being, which is particularized in the place of manifestation of the son, answered by saying: 'Oh my father, do what you have been ordered to do.' The Shaykh (R.A.) uses this sentence: 'And look, what do you see?' in the same manner as Abraham's affectionate fatherly tongue, and addresses you and says: 'And look, what do you see?', concerning whether it is One '*ayn* or many '*uyūn*. Do you see all as One '*ayn*, or do you see it as many '*uyūn*? Look, do you see the totality as One '*ayn*, or do you see many '*uyūn*? The son is the same as (essence of) his father. The state is that the son by virtue of his reality is the same as his parents, where the son, according to: 'The son is the mystery of his father', is the detailing of the necessities of some of the mysteries which are locked up in the collectivity of the oneness of the father, manifesting in the image of the son, and the detailing of the collectivity of the interiority of both parents. Thus the son in consideration of the reality is the same as the father, nevertheless he is different to him by consideration of personification and particularization because he is other than the personification of the father, and equally in consideration of the determination of both parents he is different. (He) did not see that he was immolating other than his *nafs*, and He redeemed it with a grand immolation and it manifested in the image of a ram, that which had manifested in the image of a man. Thus, when the father saw in his dream that he was immolating his son, he did not see that he was immolating anybody other than his own *nafs*. God the Great redeemed with the grand immolation the *nafs* of the father which had manifested in the image of the son. Thus it appeared in the image of the ram, that person which had appeared in the image of a man, which means that the possession of complete grandeur which is manifest in the image of the man and which appeared in the image of the ram is why Ibn 'Arabi qualified the immolation with the *kasra* sign under the letter *dhāl* and qualified it with grandeur ('*azīm*). The reality of animality, as it can appear in the image of Man, it can also manifest in the image of sheep and other images. Thus he did not sacrifice for his own *nafs* that which was lower than his *nafs* because one cannot redeem with that which is lower than that which is more

honourable. Consequently, that which appeared in the image of the ram is the possessor of grandeur which is manifest in the image of Man. Consequently, that which he sacrificed and redeemed through the image of the ram and which he saw as he was sacrificing in the image of his son, is in reality his own *nafs*. It manifested in the image of the son, no, perhaps even more, it manifested in the determination of the son, that person who was the same as the father, and that is the One Real Being which is the person in the totality of places of manifestation. Thus, since the parent and the son are united in the image of the human species and the human image equally is preserved and is persistent in accordance with its oneness of genus as the father and the son, consequently, because of the difference between the images of the father and the son, the Shaykh (R.A.) establishes the difference in the determinations of parenthood and sonhood. This he does so that even though there is difference existent in the personified image there is a unity in the images of the human genus, and the Shaykh because of this does not mention the difference through the consideration of the predominance in the way of personified image, but considers it through the difference which is in the determination, and says: And He created from him his pair, which means that He created his pair from a single *nafs*. Now, as it has been mentioned, the particularizations of createdness and creatorness are the same One 'ayn by virtue of reality. Thus the One 'ayn is the many 'uyūn through the multiplicity of particularizations, but if the One 'ayn and total Reality were particularized with total particularization, then humanness would be absolute and would become particularized by the particularization of the species. However, if It is particularized by partial particularization, then It becomes one person from among many persons, and one personal *ta'ayyun* would be like Abraham and another particularization would be Ishmael, and in the same way just as the One 'ayn and total Reality can be particularized in the image of Man and is thus manifested, It can equally be particularized in the manner of the other *ta'ayyun* and become manifested with the image of a ram. Thus, the One 'ayn which is particularized with the absolute humanness which particularized with the particularization of Abraham, did not see in the Presence of Dream that he was immolating

difference of images through the determinations upon them. Nature is equally not the same as that which manifests from it as the images which have manifested from Nature are varied by the determination which happens to be over them, because for each image particularized and manifested from the Total Nature there is a specific determination which does not exist as determination for the images other than that image, and for the Total Nature by virtue of its totality that determination does not occur. Thus, of the heat, cold, dampness and dryness, which are the four realities of Nature, a thing which manifests from Nature according to the necessities of some of these, the determination over that is not with the same determination but with a different determination. And this is cold and dry and this other is hot and dry and they are united through their dryness and differentiated with other than this. That is, a thing which is manifested from Nature can be pointed at and determined as being cold and dry and this other thing determined as hot and dry. Nature unites between these things with the dryness since it is in both things, and differentiates them by hot and cold. Thus Nature with its totality is not the same as the images which manifest from it. Nature is the collector, which means the state is that that which collects all the opposites is Nature because Nature is one reality by virtue of its matter and different things by virtue of its particularizations and images. Consequently, Nature accepts the determination of oppositions over the images because it collects in itself the opposites through their realities, and in the oppositions it is the same as the opposites but it does not collect in itself the opposites with the particularization of oppositions in the images in particularized matter, but as Nature is total absolute matter it accepts the totality of opposite images and its acceptance of all the images is equal in degree and the particularization of one image is no higher than the particularization of another. Thus Nature with its reality is the same as all the opposites and collects them all in itself. Nor yet are they the same as Nature. That is to say, Nature does not collect between the images of opposition. Rather perhaps, that which accepts the images of opposition is matter. It is Nature which is the one *'ayn* which is the place of manifestation of the images of opposites, because Nature is the collectivity of the four

realities which are heat, cold, dampness and dryness. And you say this is cold and dry for an image from among the images which manifest from Nature, and for another image you say this is hot and dry. Thus, in the opposition in the two images the collector is dryness and the differentiators are heat and cold. Thus, as the collector is Nature, so is the differentiator equally Nature. That is why he said: 'Nor yet are they the same as Nature', because what is manifest from the total is total, and finally, Total Nature, which is heat, cold, dryness, and humidity, which are oppositions, is here under the determinations of images which manifest from it, and these determinations of images do not determine over other images in exactly the same way, and again, the Total Nature, by virtue of its totality, is not under these specific determinations because it can be that it is determined by this determination but at the same time it is determined by another determination. And the universe of Nature is the images in one mirror. Thus the universe of Nature is the different images which manifest in one mirror. That is to say, the universe of Nature is the images of opposing modes in Nature which is one mirror. These words, that the universe of Nature is images in one mirror, lead to several aspects. One aspect is this, that the aim of the saying is to explain the universe of Nature, that is to say, that the images of the four realities which are collected in the *nafs* of Nature, or the relationship of Nature to the images which manifest from Nature, are like the relationships of the images which are brought about by the one mirror, to the mirror itself; and this is the example of the images of the Names which are in the mirror of the Being of the *ḥaqq*, which is the One 'ayn, and their relationships to the Ipseity. Another aspect is this, that in Nature, which is the place of effect and receptivity, are the various images which are in one mirror wherein each of the Divine and immanent realities is particularized with the *nafas ar-rahmān* by the particularity of a reality. Another aspect is this, which is an example for the fact that the universe of Nature, with the images which are manifest in it, is like the station of one mirror for the images of the One Ipseity in Divine relationship with essential happenings which are the One 'ayn. Another aspect is this, that Nature is the manifestedness of the Divine Ipseity. Thus, that Nature is the one mirror for the Divine and

immanential images is the same as that it is one mirror for the images of the Divine Names and the images of the possibilities of being of the Divine Ipseity, because Nature is the appearance of the Divinity, perhaps even that it is the same as that. Yet another aspect is this, that the universe of Nature is the images which are manifested in the Being of God which is one mirror. Nor is it not perhaps that it is one image in different mirrors. No, perhaps rather that the universe of Nature is one image manifested in different mirrors which are manifest by the particularities of the mirror of Reality and of *a'yān*. According to this aspect, the Arabic sentence is an example for the manifestation of the One Being of the *ḥaqq* in the mirrors of different *a'yān* by virtue of the *a'yān*. Another aspect is this, that the universe of Nature is one image in the Divine Names which are different mirrors. Consequently, the universe of Nature is one image manifesting in accordance with the ordinations of the realities of the Names in the mirrors of the Divine Names, because the image of the Being of the One God is manifested in the images of receptivity and effectedness of Nature which is the summarized in the intelligible Nature. And because of the revelation of the One Being of the *ḥaqq* to the images of intelligible Nature, the *nafas-i-rahmānī* and the Divine Names are particularized in the mirrors of the images of Nature, just as the images of Nature are manifested in the Being of God which is one mirror. Consequently, it is also suitable to multiply in this way other remaining aspects in accordance with the pre-mentioned ways. After this there is nothing but perplexity (*ḥayra*) because of the differences of vision. Consequently, in accordance with this consideration, there is nothing in existence except perplexity due to the differences of the vision of the people of veils, because the people of veils are in perplexity on whether they should determine that it is one as they look at the one image which is manifest in different mirrors with intellectual reasoning, or whether it is many when they look at the many images that manifest in one mirror. Consequently, as their visions are different their knowledge ends in perplexity and there is nothing left for them except perplexity. And if someone knows what we have said he is not in perplexity, that is to say, that the One Being of God appears in the *a'yān* with different images by virtue of different particularizations

and receives different determinations. Thus, if a person knew that the One Being of God is one with Its Ipseity and many with the particularizations of the Names, he is not perplexed. Rather, he will know the order as it is, because both orders are true, in consideration of the observation of the plurality in the One Ipseity because the One Ipseity is revealed by the images of the *a'yān*, equally in consideration of the observation of the Being of One in many images because the images of plurality are realized by the Uniqueness of Reality, and he would be emphatically in the increase of knowledge. In fact, the gnostic who is not in perplexity is certainly in the increase of knowledge in both ways of observation, but his knowledge refers totally to the *'ayn-i-thābita* which is the witnessing of the Being of the One God in the *a'yān* by virtue of the *a'yān*. Consequently, the increasedness of knowledge refers to the *a'yān-i-thābita* and not to God, and that is when he is not in perplexity. But he is in perplexity in the increase of knowledge through the determination of: 'Lord, increase me knowledge-wise' (*rabb zidni 'ilman*). That is why the Shaykh said: And it is not except from the determination of the place. That is to say, consequently, that this increase does not result except through the determination of the place because there is no specification or condition for the Being of the *ḥaqq* because the *ḥaqq* is the Reality of each reality which is realized by it in the realities of the *a'yān*. And the place is the same as the *'ayn-i-thābita* and therein God varies in the places of revelation. The truth is that this place is the same as the *'ayn-i-thābita*. Consequently, the *ḥaqq* becomes varied in the places of revelation with the *'ayn-i-thābita*. That is to say, by virtue of the specifications of the *a'yān-i-thābita* God becomes varied in revelation because revelation occurs by virtue of the *a'yān* and the *a'yān* are varied by the specifications of the Ipseity. And the determinations become varied over Him and He accepts all determinations, and there does not determine over Him except the *'ayn* wherein He is revealed. That is to say, even though the *ḥaqq* accepts all determinations, only the determination of the *'ayn* of this place determines over Him, and that place is wherein the *ḥaqq* has revealed Himself. In other words, the *ḥaqq* accepts all the determinations that the *a'yān-i-thābita*, wherein the *ḥaqq* has revealed Himself, bestow on Him, just like the aspect which

appears circular in a circular mirror and rectangular in a rectangular mirror. Consequently, the determinations become varied over the *ḥaqq* by virtue of the place, which is the *a'yān*, and with the varieties of determinations the *ḥaqq* became determined upon. Thus, each *'ayn* becomes determiner over the *ḥaqq* by virtue of the specific determination which it contains. However, God does not accept determinations except from His own Self because by the universality of His own Ipseity over each *'ayn* He determines with that thing which is in each *'ayn*. And after, there is nothing except this. That is, in the order and in verification there is nothing further than this, which means that nothing determines over the *ḥaqq* by different determinations except the determinations of the *a'yān* wherein God has revealed Himself. Consequently, always and from all eternity the *ḥaqq* reveals Himself to the *'ayān-i-thābita* and receives the determinations which they bestow on Him and never ceases to be manifest with them and with different determinations and with different variations. Equally, He is not removed from being witnessed in them and with them, and His Knowledge which is consequent to His revelation in the *a'yān* is not removed from manifesting and being increased.

And the *ḥaqq* is the *khalq* by this aspect, so consider,
 And He is not *khalq* by the other aspect, so remember.

In consideration of the meaning that the One Being of the *ḥaqq* is manifested in different mirrors and is varied in the places of reflection of the *a'yān* and receives the totality of the determinations of the *a'yān*, by this aspect the *ḥaqq* is *khalq*. Thus, with the eye of vision look at it and witness the *ḥaqq* in the images of the *a'yān*. In this line the words: '... by this aspect' he refers to the words: 'He is one image in different mirrors.' In consideration of the other aspect, that is to say, considering the Essential Singularity and the totality of the Divine images in the Presence of Oneness, the *ḥaqq* is not *khalq* where in the mirror of the One Being of God the images of the *a'yān* are manifested, and the *ḥaqq*, being transcended from the qualifications of immanentiality, is veiled by His own Veil of Dearness and Greatness and persists in His Essential Unknowableness, so remember! In short, it means, you remember these two aspects so that you come

to know the discrimination between the two degrees. The words: '... by the other aspect' refer to his previous words: '... images in one mirror.'

**He who understands what I have said, his vision will
not weaken,
And does not understand except for whom there is
vision.**

This is to say that if a person understood what I have pointed at of the two aspects, his vision will not slacken or vary in witnessing the *ḥaqq* in totalling and differentiation, and in oneness and plurality. It is also possible to understand the above quote of the Shaykh in the sense that his vision will not be abandoned by the help and assistance of God. Yet the state is such that he will not understand what I have mentioned unless he is such a person for whom there is resultant an iron vision, like God said concerning the Prophet: 'Your vision today is iron.'

**Totalling and discrimination is indeed One 'ayn,
And it, the multiplicity, is not allowed to persist, nor to
remain.**

That is to say, collecting the *ḥaqq* and the *khalq* in the degree of the collectivity of the uniqueness, and differentiating them in the degree of multiplicity and differentiation, is in fact One 'ayn, that is to say, it is in accordance with the Uniqueness of the Divine Ipseity, and even though the state is such that by virtue of the Names and Qualities the 'ayn is many, that Single Essence, by virtue of Its Uniqueness, does not allow this plurality to persist and does not let it remain without annihilating it completely. In other words, if the One 'ayn revealed Itself, It would not allow to persist anything of this plurality and would not leave it in appearance; rather, It would annihilate the totality of the plurality, and having caused it not to exist It would render it lost and dispersed. Referring to the words: 'And after, there is nothing except Him', oneness and multiplicity, collectivity and differentiation, *ḥaqq* and the *khalq*, absoluteness and relativity, particularization and non-particularization, manifestation and interiority,

are all relationships and qualifications, and there is no reality for all these other than the One Being of God. In consideration of this, then the words: '. . . is not allowed to persist, nor to remain', have one actor which is the One Essence. After this he refers to the Wisdom and says:

For the One who is High by His own *nafs*, He is the One for whom there is completion, who drowns therein the totality of the order of being and the relationships of non-existence by virtue of the fact that it is not possible for any one of these qualificatives to make Him pass away from it or to be other than it, whether these be praiseworthy by knowledge, by intelligence or by law, or whether they be blameworthy knowledge-wise, or by intellect or by law. That is to say, that Being which by Himself, in other words, by His own Essence and Reality, is High, for that Being there is resultant completion and perfection, and it is with that that He drowns the totality of the orders of being and relationships of non-existence. By virtue of this there is not a single qualification which would remove Him from those orders of being and relationships of non-existence, nor could there be any outside His compass, and it is all the same whether these orders are praiseworthy through knowledge or intelligence or law, or whether they are blameworthy through knowledge, intelligence and law. In other words, the One Being of the *ḥaqq* who is called by the Name *Allāh* and who is High and Absolute with the essential height, whose completeness and perfection covers and includes the totality of completenesses and perfections of being and qualities of Reality and relationships of qualifications and non-existences, and who cannot be removed by any one of these above-mentioned qualifications and where it is not possible for any one of these qualifications to be beyond His compass, whether these qualifications be praiseworthy or blameworthy by knowledge, intelligence or law, is He for whom any relationship is equal, and His manifestation and being qualified by one of these qualifications is not prior or superior to His manifestation and qualification by another qualificative. And this is not like this except particularly for that which is named *Allāh*. But really this essential height and absolute perfection and completion is not established except particularly for that which is called *Allāh* which is

the Divine Ipseity. One and Eternal and forever, and which is manifested by the Real Perfect and Complete Man. Thus, the Ipseity of God, which is particularized by the First Particularization, is named by the Name *Allāh*, and for the Ipseity of God that Name is the Biggest Name (*ism-i-a'zam*) which denotes and guides to the Singularity of the Ipseity of the completion of the totality of the totalities. Consequently, the Ipseity of God (*Allāh*) which is named as *Allāh* by virtue of being particularized with the essential completion and perfection of the Reality of Man drowns in Itself the totality of the essences of being and the relationships of non-existence, and the qualificatives and qualifications of blameworthiness and praiseworthiness. And there is nothing outside the width of Its circle and Its total encompassing. Do not let it ever occur to the conjecturer of the conjecturer that that which is called *Allāh* is multiple in this multiplicity, because God is high beyond manifesting with things which diminish the Divine completeness and perfection because the High God is the singularity of all the perfections and completions of effective Names and the active realities of necessarily-so-ness and totality of being. But for others than which are named particularly with the Name *Allāh*, they are no other than places of revelation (*majlā*) for Him or an image therein, and if there are places of revelation for Him, necessarily because of this there occurs superiority between a place of revelation and another place of revelation. In other words, for anything other than that which is particularly called by the Name of God (*Allāh*), it is a place of revelation for God or it is an image which is manifest in the mirror of the *haqq*, and if that which is named with another Name is a place of revelation for God, then there happens to be superiority among places of revelation. It is absolutely impossible that there should not be superiority between one place of revelation and another place of revelation, because the witnessing of the Being of the One God in the essences (sources) (*a'yān*) necessitates that the essences and sources are places of revelation for Him. Consequently, because of these sources and essences there exist aspects for God, and the superiority of one place of revelation to another exists due to the fact that God manifests in them, because in some of them He is manifested with a totality of Names like in the Complete and Perfect Man,

or He is manifested with a number of Names like in the man who is not complete and perfect, or He is manifested with a small amount of Names like in the animals, and after that in the plants, and after that with the minimum of Names where He is manifested as in the minerals. Consequently, there is no essential completeness and perfection for each of the places of revelation from among the places of revelation, but rather perhaps there is a portion for it from completion and perfection by virtue of this fact of being a place of manifestation, and by virtue of being a place of manifestation there occurs among the places of revelation a certain superiority of one to the other. Consequently, the portion for each one of these from the essential height is by virtue of his capacity to encompass or lack of capacity to encompass. And if it was that, that is to say, that which is not called *Allāh*, that the image was therein, such an image then is the same as the essential completeness and perfection because it is the same as that which has manifested therein, and this one is that which is named *Allāh*, and He is the one that is the same as the image. That is, if the one named by another Name is an image in the mirror of God, then for that image there results the same as the essential completeness and perfection because that image is the same as that thing which has manifested in it. Consequently, the essential completion and perfection which is established for the Being which is called by the Name *Allāh*, becomes equally established for that one image which manifests from the Being of God. Consequently, it is necessary to witness the images in the Being of God for each of which there is resultant the same as the essential completion and perfection which is already established for that which is called with the Name *Allāh*, which is the One Being of God. Then the difference between the two witnessings and considerations is this, that if that which is called other than *Allāh* is the place of reflection for the *ḥaqq*, then it is necessarily inevitable that there should be superiority of one to the other among the higher degrees of the places of revelation. On the other hand, if the image in the *ḥaqq*, that is to say, if it is a Name for the *ḥaqq*, for that one there is essential completion and perfection because it is inclusive of the Ipseity, or equally because the Name is the same as the one Named. With his words: '... because it is the same as that which has manifested

therein', he points to this, so this is when it is considered that the Name is the same as the one Named, but if the Name is other than the one Named, under this consideration there is no essential completeness in that case, but perhaps rather there is a portion resultant for it from the perfection and completion. Consequently, even among the Names there happens to be superiority of some over the others like there is in the places of revelation. And one does not say they are Him, nor that they are other, which means that one cannot say for the image which is established for the Ipseity which is that which is called *Allāh*, that that image is the same, because the image of a thing is not the same as the thing in all its aspects. Equally, one cannot say that that image is other in all the aspects than that which is named *Allāh* because it is the image of the Ipseity and it cannot be removed entirely from that which is Named. In other words, in consideration of particularization and particularity they are not Him, but in consideration of Reality they are no other than Him. Consequently, each Name of the Divine Names is high by its own self and there is resultant for each one of them an essential completion or perfection, and each Name is named by all the Divine Names.

In fact, Abu-l Qasim ibn Qasiy pointed in his '*Khal'*' (in his book called *Khal' al-Na'layn*) to this with his word that all the Divine Names are named by all the Divine Names and are qualified by them. Ibn Qasiy is one of the great shaykhs of the Maghreb and among his works there is the book *Khal' al-Na'layn* which the Shaykh, God be pleased with him, has annotated. This means that in fact Abu-l Qasim, who is Ibn Qasiy, has pointed to this meaning in his book called *Khal' al-Na'layn*, meaning that in fact all the Divine Names are called by all the Divine Names and become qualified by them. That is to say, whichever Name you take from among the Divine Names, say for instance, the Creator (*khāliq*) or the Nourisher (*rāziq*), and place in the place of the beginning as the nominative or subject to a clause or to a verb or the first thought, that Name bears the Name *Allāh* and the other Divine Names totally and singularly, and that Name is qualified by all the Names. And this here, that is to say, in this place, is that all Names guide to the Ipseity and to the meaning which has been mentioned for it and which it demands, and because

of its guiding to the *dhāt*, to It is the totality of the Names, and because of its guiding to the meaning it is singularized and differentiated from the others, like the Lord (*rabb*) or the Creator (*khāliq*) or the Fashioner (*muṣawwir*) and others like this, and the Name (actually) is what It is by virtue of the Ipseity, and the Name is other than what It is called by virtue of the thing which is specific to that Name which has been appointed to that Name from the meaning which has been mentioned for it. That is to say, the reason why that each Name from among the Divine Names is called by the totality of the Divine Names and that they are qualified by them is explained in this place is this, that in fact each Name points at, guides to, the Ipseity, and also to that meaning which is that that Name was placed for that meaning and that meaning requires that Name, that is to say, necessitates it. Thus, by virtue of each Name guiding to and denoting the Ipseity there results for each Name all the Divine Names and that Name then becomes called by all the Divine Names and becomes qualified by all of them, and through this aspect He is them, and equally, by virtue of the fact that each Name denotes and guides to a meaning by which that Name is singularized for it, that Name becomes differentiated from other Names, like Lord, like Creator and like Fashioner, and others like these. Thus, a Name by virtue of the Ipseity is the same as what is called by that Name, and equally, it is other than that which is Named by virtue of the thing that is special to that Name because of the meaning which is placed for that Name, by which meaning that Name is differentiated from another Name.

And if you understand what is the height in what we have mentioned and you understand that in fact the highest degree of height is the height of Ipseity, and that that which is high is that which has the essential height, then you understand that that which is the height of the height, it is not the height of place, nor the height of position, because the height of position is special to the propinquity of the order, like the sultan, the judges, the viziers and the *qāḍīs* and all the appointed people, for which appointment they have ability or they have not, whereas the height by qualification is not like that. You would know that in fact the height of the height is not the height of place or the height of position, because the height of position is

particular to the order of succession like the sultan, the judges, and the viziers and the *qāḍīs*, and also, equally, like all people who are appointed, whether there be in him the ability necessary for that appointment, like the just sultan or the equable judge, the intelligent vizier and the non-ignorant *qāḍī*, or whether they are not so, and equally the height which is through quality and qualification is not the same as the height of position because the one who is high by the height of position does not remain in height when that position is removed from him, like in the case of the sultan, judge, vizier and *qāḍī* who have been dismissed from their appointment, because the height of position is in reality for the degrees, not for themselves, whereas for the high person who is qualified by the Divine Qualities like Knowledge and Ability, the height is not removed, and the essential height is higher than the height of all degrees.

Height is according to four parts. The highest of them is the Essential height of the Ipseity, next comes the height of qualification, then comes the height appertaining to place, and then the height of the place itself, and all these parts are special to God, and God is High in all parts of height, totally and summarily, and for the Perfect and Complete Man there is a very abundant portion from all parts of height. Yet it sometimes happens that the one who is high by height of quality falls under the dominion of a person who is high by appointment in certain orders, like the determination of the ignorant sultan and non-intelligent vizier over a man who is the most knowledgeable and most intelligent of people. The Shaykh, God be pleased with him, said: And that he might be the most knowledgeable of the people, yet he is determined over by he who has an appointment allowing him determination, whether he be of the most ignorant of people. Because such is the fact that it sometimes happens that the most knowledgeable of men is dominated by a person who has a dominant appointment even though that man is the most ignorant of people, and such is height by position, by the determination over the followers and subjects, and he is not high in his own being, because if he is dismissed from office his elevation is removed, and the gnostic is not like this. Thus, the person who determines over others by appointment, determining over followers and subjects, is high by posi-

tion. He is not high in his own *nafs* because his height is in relation to that degree and his subjection to it, and if he were to be dismissed from his appointment he has not any elevation left because of the fact that he has no followers or subjects left. whereas the gnostic who is high by qualification is not like this because his elevation does not disappear and he does not get dismissed from his appointment, and God guides whom He wishes to the straight path.

The Wisdom of Ecstasy and Rapture
(*al-ḥikmat al-muhaymiyya*)
in the Word of Abraham

(*Muhaym* is from the word *yahīm* in the passive, *ismi maf'ūl*). When the intimately penetrated friend (Abraham) was called the 'Intimate Friend' (*khalīl*) he was intimately penetrated and encompassed by all that which qualified the Divine Ipseity. The prophet Abraham (S.A.), the *khalīl*, was called with the Name *khalīl*, that is, intimate among all the Divine Names by which the Divine Ipseity was qualified, because he was made intimate and because he was embraced and encompassed by all the Qualifications. That is to say, having become intimate with all the Names and image of the Divine Ipseity, he collected in himself and encompassed the totality of the Divine Attributes. Consequently, as the Divine Attributes and Names became present with Abraham, then Abraham equally becomes present with their reality of presence in the reality of the places of manifestation of the Names and Attributes. Thus he becomes qualified with the totality of the Divine Attributes and Names of the Ipseity and becomes intimate in all of them, and the Divine Essential Love becomes fluent in all the essences and realities of Abraham, and Abrahamic love equally becomes fluent in the realities of Presences. Thus, under the first consideration he was called 'intimate' as the subject (the actor), and he became equally under the second consideration ('intimate') as the object (the acted-upon). The poet says:

You have become intimate in me, coursing as the spirit
in me,
That is why Khalil was called *khalīl*.

Khalīl having the meaning of action of intimacy whereby it becomes intimate to the Divine Qualities, the Shaykh, may God be pleased with him, points at it through the words of the poet and means to

explain that the poet, addressing his beloved which is to him like his spirit, says: 'You have intimately penetrated into the courses of the spirit in me.' In other words, like my spirit penetrates intimately in all parts of my limbs and my body, you have in that same way intimately penetrated into the courses of my spirit, and it is because of this that Khalil was called *khalīl*. In matters of love, intimacy built upon similarity is often used. That the servant is qualified with the totality of the Divine Qualities and that he encompasses the totality of the Qualities does not mean this kind of intimacy. Rather, it is like the total annihilation of the qualities of the servant in consequence of the revelation of the Divine Qualities, and the presence of the servant with the reality of presence through the Divine Qualities until the servant is called by the Divine Names.

Thus, God said: 'I shall bring you to the people as leader.' In reality the meaning of '*khilla*', from which comes the word '*khalīl*', is in this case the manifestation of Abraham with the Divine Image. Thus the *ḥaqq* becomes the hearing, the sight and the other powers of Abraham, whereby Abraham hears with God, sees with God. This love is called the closeness of supererogatives because the qualities of the servant are additions for the ipseity of the servant. Consequently, the *fanā'* (non-being) of the servant in God through the Qualities is the love of the supererogatories, that is, the additions. Consequently, it is as if Abraham had intimately penetrated the Divine Presences and the Divine Qualities. Thus, as his *nafs* approached God with its qualities, in the same way God dressed him in His own Qualities and made him manifest with the Divine Image. Like that which is coloured is intimately penetrated by the colour, and it immanences its exposition by virtue of its jewel, and it is not a case like place and position. (In Arabic the letter *kāf* is attached to intimate penetration to explain and exemplify the intimate penetration of the *khalīl* among the Divine Qualities.) In other words, Khalil (S.A.) is the Divine Ipseity. Being intimately penetrant in the Divine Qualities his ipseity becomes hidden in the Divine Ipseity, and his qualities having become non-existent he appears, being qualified by the Divine Qualities, exactly like the colour intimately penetrates that which is coloured and is fluent in all the parts of the one that is coloured. Thus, exposition,

which is colour, appears in the place of the jewel of the one that is coloured, and all differentiation between the two is removed. That penetration is not the same as that of place and position. That is to say, it is not like the penetration of the one that has the position into the place. When the colour intimately penetrates that which is coloured, it is fluent in all parts of that which is coloured, and under this consideration he becomes he (*huwa huwa*) and there can be no discrimination between them through the senses. Therefore the presentation is fluent in all the parts of the jewel because the intimate penetration of the presentation in the jewel is its fluency because it pervades all parts of the jewel, so much so that there is not any part of the parts of the jewel, whether it be outwardly or inwardly, that is devoid of that presentation, like a colour fluent in the totality of a body.

The word *mā* in the Arabic is to mean 'not so', which makes the sentence mean that this intimate penetration is not the same as a thing that is settled in a place penetrating another object which is the abode of that thing. If it were so, it would necessitate that the *ḥaqq* becomes an envelope for the *khalīl*, or the contrary, that the *khalīl* would become an envelope for the *ḥaqq*, or that *ḥulūl* (incarnation, occupation of a space by another) would become necessary, but all these are wrong. He (the Shaykh) compared the reasonable, or that which is reached with the intellect, with the unreasonable, which is that which is reached through perception or by the senses, to allow these students to understand, because all that happens in the Witnessing is an indication of what happens in the Unknowable, and the reasonable things are inferred (deduced) by the things that are perceptible and things that are sensed.

Or the penetrating of the *ḥaqq* into the being of the image of Abraham. This means: or the reason why Khalil was called *khalīl* is because God intimately penetrated the being of the image of Abraham, and the intimate penetration and the fluency of the *ḥaqq* into the being of the image of Abraham is the qualification of the *ḥaqq* by the qualities of Abraham and the image of Abraham. The Shaykh (R.A.) said: '. . . the *ḥaqq* into the being of the image of Abraham', but did not say: '. . . the *ḥaqq* into the image of Abraham' to preserve it from

transcending the images of people into the *haqq*. Thus, by virtue of the fact that God with His Being was particularized in the image of the being of Abraham, consequently all the qualities from among the creatural qualities which qualified Abraham became attributed to the *haqq*. Thus the *haqq* becomes the actor in the place of manifestation of Abraham and becomes hearer with his hearing and seer with his eyes. And from this all determinations are true because for every determination there is an abode wherein it manifests. (In certain copies it would be that for each determination there is resultant an abode and a station because of which that determination manifests due to that abode. This is the case where in the Arabic sentence above there is the letter 'b', but if it were to mean 'fithi' it would mean for each determination there results an abode. That determination manifests in that abode and does not transgress from it.)

Now, Abraham's penetration to the Divine Qualities is in the abode of the Presence of Divinity which is the highest arc of the circle of being which includes the two arcs. This is where the Divine Qualities are particularized and collected. Thus, if a man reached a degree of annihilation of the qualities of being human and approached the Truth with the closeness of supererogatory works and became qualified with the Divine Qualities, thus rising to the abode of the highest arc, then he becomes the place of manifestation of the collectivity of Names and Qualities of the highest arc which is in the Divine Presence, and the predications of the Divine Qualities become manifest in him because he is then in the abode of the Divine Qualities, and the determination of qualifying Abraham with the Divine Qualities does not transgress from this abode, and the penetration of the *haqq* into the image of the being of Abraham and His manifesting in the image of Abraham and His being qualified by the Abrahamian creatural qualities is due to His particularization in the being of Abraham, and the abode of the particularization of the immanential qualities is the universe of possibilities and this is the lowest arc of the circle of being. Consequently, when God descends to the lowest arc through aspects of particularization or manifestation He becomes manifest with creatural qualities, and because He is particularized in the being of the person who is particularized in the lowest arc, the creatural qualities

emanate from Him. That God manifests with creatural qualities such as oppression, deceit, mockery, fraud, magic, illness, hunger and thirst, is established through the Quran and *ḥadīth*. These qualities of lack are attributed to Him as consequences of the abode but it does not pass beyond or out of or transgress from the abode of the universe. The Divine Personality is always transcendent from the qualities of subsequentialities. Do you not see God, that He manifests with the qualities of subsequentialities, and that indeed He gave news of Himself through such manifestations with qualities of lack and qualities of blame? (This is a witnessing for the second determination.) This is the determination of God penetrating the image of Abraham and being qualified by subsequentialities. That is to say, do you not see the *ḥaqq* that manifests with the qualities of subsequentialities, and that in fact with this manifestation He gives news of His own Self, and that He manifests with the qualities of lack and the qualities of blame, which in the degrees of intellect or in religious law or in general behaviour calls for lack and blame? God's manifestation with the qualities of subsequentiality is attested in such Quranic phrases as: 'God deceived them', 'God mocked them', etc., and His mention of His being hungry and ill, and hungry and thirsty, and in the true *ḥadīth* where it is said: 'God laughed at what they did . . .' Thus God manifests with the qualities of subsequentiality in the subsequentialities by virtue of subsequentiality. Do you not see how the creature is manifested with the Qualities of God from his beginning to his end? (This is a witnessing for the first determination which is the determination for the penetration of Abraham into the Divine Qualities and his being qualified with the Qualities of the *ḥaqq*.) That is to say, do you not see the creature who is manifested from the beginning to the end with the Qualities of God? The creature who is manifest with the Divine Qualities is the Perfect Man (*insān-i-kāmil*). God indeed created Adam in His own Image, and the image of God is the image of the collectivity of the Divine Names and Qualities, not one of the Divine Qualities remaining outside the circumference of this totality. It is perhaps rather that the Divine Qualities are present by him (the Perfect Man) and he is the place of manifestation of the determinations. And that is why: And all of it is true for him. That is to say, all

the Divine Qualities are true (that is to say, the right) for the creature who is the Perfect Man. That is to say, because of all that it is the right (desert) of the manifestations through the width of receptivity and total aptitude, because the reality of the creature is God who is manifested in the *'ayn-i-thābita* of the creature with His Reality. Thus, by virtue of reality the Divine Qualities are established for and are the right of the creature. This is equally so by virtue of his imaging of the Divine totality. And it is possible that the word 'right' (desert) means 'established', that is to say that the totality of the Divine Qualities is established for Man. Just as the qualities of subsequentiality are a right for God. In fact, the qualities of subsequentiality are the right of God, or they are established for God, because the qualities of subsequentiality are His happenings, businesses, as in: 'Every day He is in another business.' The reality of the qualities of subsequentiality is the *ḥaqq*, who, in consideration of manifestation and particularization in certain creatural manifestations, manifests with them. 'And He is present and witnessing in everything', thus He is present in everything through the consideration of the fluency of His Quality of the Supreme Self (*huwiyya*), and He is revealed in each place of manifestation, and observant from it, through it. When the being of the subsequentialities is the Being of God which is manifest in them, then firstly the qualities of subsequentiality become qualities for God, like when He says: 'Say: He, God, is One.' Equally where He says: '*Al-ḥamdu lillāh*', praise and gratitude is for God. Thus God establishes praise and gratitude for God whether the word *ḥamd* is used to mean the praise-giver or whether it be to whom praise is given, and there is no doubt that the creature also gives praise and is given praise by the word of God and through the words of other prophets and believers, some of whom render praise to some others. All this considering that both the praise-giver and receiver of praise is God, it is apparent that praise is for God alone. However, when the praise-giver and receiver of praise is creature, the aspect is like this, that God is manifest in the image of the praise-giver through the aspect of particularization, and by praise manifests His own perfection, and that equally, praise which is the quality of each receiver of praise is the same as God who is revealed in all His perfection in the image of that

which receives praise, and that through that very perfection the receiver of praise deserves the praise. Praise is the quality of one perfection from among the Qualities of God which emanates from the Reality of God. Consequently, the praise which is in the place of manifestation of the praise-giver, in view of the perfection which is manifest in the place of manifestation of the praise-giver and praise-receiver, is also God. That is why he (the Shaykh) says: The results ensuing from the praise of each praise-giver and receiver of praise refer back and return to God, because in reality that which receives praise with the perfections which are manifest through each place of manifestation and each being, is God, because it is God who is individuated (*muta'ayyin*) in each place of manifestation and is the same as that. Equally, the praise-giver is in reality God because those perfections and praises which are in the place of manifestation of that praise-giver, and that which manifests with those perfections, is the *haqq*, and He is the praise-giver, the receiver of praise, and the praise. However, as He said, all the results of praise return to Him from all praise-givers and praise-receivers, thereby specifying the return of the praises to God, leaving outside of this non-praise-receiving orders, yet the state is such that the beginning and the reference of all orders is God. Therefore he (the Shaykh) generalized the predication of the return of the order by specifying and affirming with the word 'all', and said: And to Him returns the order, all of it, which means that the totality of the order, whether it be praise-receiver or blame-receiver, returns to God. And that the order should return to God became general to blame or praise, and yet after that there is nothing but the praised or the blamed in being. Thus, the determination of the return of the order to God became general to include all that is blameworthy or praiseworthy, so the state is such that there is not in being anything other than that which is praised and that which is blamed. Nevertheless, in his words where he mentions the return of all the results of praise and of all order to God, there are several aspects. One aspect is like has been mentioned. It happens due to the fact that the Being of God is particularized and appears in the places of manifestation of things whereby each creature's actions or qualities refer to God because of abode. Another aspect is as follows: here

the qualities which are attributed to the creature's being the place of manifestation due to particularization as creature, and what consequently manifests, is attributed to God. A third aspect is that each creature's action and quality by way of effusion is inferred from the Being of God by virtue of place of origin. Yet another aspect is that the *a'yān* of being, being non-existent (*ma'dūm*) in His Self, they exist through the revelations of Names and Divine particularizations. Consequently, if that which is manifest in the *a'yān* of being is the particularizations of the Divine Names, and if that which is particularized in the First Particularization (*ta'ayyun*) and in the Presence of Knowledge is the Names, the Divine Qualities and relationships and attributions and essential businesses, when the qualifications and attributes are removed at the level of the revelation of the Ipseity, which is the Grand Resurrection, then the Divine particularizations, the Lordly revelations which are related to the places of revelation by virtue of the nature of the places of revelation, and the particularizations of the Divine Names and Qualities and the images of the knowledge of the Divine Unknowability, return to the Divine Ipseity which is the beginning of all particularizations. Where it concerns the generalization in the blame, this blame does not result for or become incumbent upon intellect or religious law or custom except in accordance with relative particularization. If the view is cut off from this relative particularization, by virtue of its reality it reverts back to praise and gratitude (*ḥamd*). For instance, sexuality is blameworthy. Adulterer and adultery are both blameworthy, yet it is without a doubt that the blameworthy sex attraction which is fluent in the being of the self, is praiseworthy by virtue of it being the strength and the shadow of Essential Divine Love. The non-existence of this (of the Divine Love) which is error and fornication is in itself blameworthy. At the same time, when one considers that it is essentially human (*insān* = intimate), and considering that adultery and union are actions of completeness, if Man were incapable of this he would be lacking and blameworthy. Consequently, sexual attraction, in consideration of its reality being Divine Love, and in consideration of its particularization in the images of masculinity and femininity and because it is the cause of giving birth to samples and preserves the

human genus, and because it causes to bring about the taste of a kind of completion from among the revelations of Divine Beauty and is equally the cause of the manifestation of the Perfect Man, who is a gnostic of God and by essential worship is assiduous in the devotion (*'ākif*) of God, and in consideration that it is an emergence from His emergence and perhaps even because it is also an image of Divine Love and an image of the collectivity of Divinity, and further, by consideration of the fact that it is the origin of the Divine and immanental perfections which are manifested in the place of manifestation which is the humankind, it certainly is praiseworthy. Thus, even adultery, if one takes it out of the context of the limits of religious law and out of the viewpoint of total natural sexuality and effectively relates it to the act of completion of being and other such relationships, it is praiseworthy. Thus blameworthiness reverts to praiseworthiness. Perhaps rather that blameworthiness does not revert to praiseworthiness, because that which is seen as blameworthy is under another point of view praiseworthy but is manifested at the end of certain relationships with latter accidents in the image of blameworthiness. There is no aspect of blameworthiness except when sexuality does not obey religious law or intelligence. Sexuality is blameworthy when it is not within the obedience of intelligence and religious law. The non-happening of sexuality is due to the necessities of religious law. This causes the cutting off of relationship and heirdom and causes rebellion against order and it promotes mischief. But these last are orders of non-existence. They belong to the consideration of immanental particularizations; but although they are in accordance with non-existence, they are all the same aspects of possibilities and they refer and return to the qualities of possibilities. Without a doubt, being and necessarily-so-ness and all their determinations are praiseworthy, and equally the order of being is praiseworthy. Thus all orders of praise and blame return to God. But the return of the blameworthy is not in consideration of the fact that it is blameworthy due to a relationship with certain orders of non-existence of attribution, but rather that it is through the consideration of the reality of the original orders which are manifested as images of blame, or equally they return by virtue of the fact that they are praiseworthy things in consideration of their

being relationships of being which is preferable to the relationships of accidental attribution. 'Everything is from Him by virtue of origin and manifestation, and to Him is the return, the ultimate state and the goal and completion.' This has here been pointed at with *āyāt* to familiarize the weak intelligences and to establish and encourage the veiled selves, but the people of *kashf* and witnessing and the people of taste and being witness the order as it is.

Know that in fact something does not penetrate a thing except if it was carried in it. Know that in fact it is rather that the state is such that one thing does not penetrate another thing unless the thing which penetrates is carried in that in which it is penetrated (with the diacritical sign *fatha*), because the thing that penetrates effects, attains the jewel of the other thing, like the fluency of water penetrating into the tree. The penetrator (with the sign *kasra* of the letter *lām*), the active participle with exaggeration, is veiled by the penetrated (with the *fatha* of the *lām*) which is the passive participle, and the passive participle is the manifest, and the active participle is the interior and covered. Thus, the penetrator (*mutakhallil*) which is the active participle is veiled by the passive participle which is the penetrated (*mutakhallal*), consequently the passive participle is manifest and the active participle is interior and is covered. Consequently, that which is penetrated is manifest and is the bearer, and the penetrator is covered and interior and carried in that. And it (that is to say, the penetrator with the *kasra* of the *lām*) is food for it, (that is to say, the penetrated with the *fatha* of the *lām*), just like penetration of water into wool, which possesses it and enlarges it. That is to say, the *mutakhallil* with the *kasra* of the *lām* is food for the *mutakhallal* with the *fatha* of the *lām*, like water penetrates wool and the wool increases with water and enlarges. Thus, Abraham (S.A.), being *mutakhallal*, the passive participle, to the totality of the Divine Presences, is carried in the Divine Presences and becomes veiled by them. (The identification at this point between Abraham as the being of an image and that which penetrates it is so complete that the position of Abraham is transformed from being the passive participle to being the active participle, and is veiled by the Divine Presences and Qualifications and becomes interior and covered as the active participle. Hence) the

totality of the Names and Qualities of God become manifest over him. Thus Abraham becomes food for God with all the determinations and praises and Names and Qualities. In the same way, the Being of God, being *mutakhallil* in the image of Abraham, becomes veiled in that image. Consequently, God becomes Abraham's hearing and sight and his other powers. Now, as *mutakhallil* is the interior, it becomes manifest through *mutakhallal*. However, the manifest is nourished by the interior because effusion does not manifest on the apparent except through the interior. Consequently, the interior is the nourishment for the exterior, and the apparent is nourished by the interior because its presence, its being and its establishment is through that. If the servant becomes *mutakhallil* and interior, then God would be *mutakhallal* and apparent, and the servant becomes nourishment and strength for God with the Names and Qualities. However, if God becomes *mutakhallil* and interior the servant becomes *mutakhallal* and manifest and the *ḥuqq* becomes for the servant his powers and his nourishment. If it were that He, God, was the apparent, and the immanence was covered therein, then it would be that the immanence is the totality of the Divine Names and His hearing (and His sight and hand and foot) and all His relationships and comprehensions, and if the immanence were manifest, then God is covered and interior therein, then God is the hearing of the immanence and its eye and its hand and its foot and the totality of its powers, just as has arrived in the veridic news. Therefore, if, as in the first case, God was manifest, then it would have been the immanence which would have been hidden and covered in it. Consequently, it would be the immanence that would be God's totality of Names and His hearing and His sight and His foot and all His relationships and comprehensions, but if it were, on the contrary, the immanence which were manifest, then it is God who is covered and hidden in the immanence. Consequently, it is God who would be the hearing, the sight, the hand, the foot and all the powers of the immanence, which in fact has arrived through the veridic news. What is meant by the veridic news is the veridic *ḥadīth*, which is the word of God which says: 'When My servant approaches Me with supererogatory works I become his hearing, his sight, his hand and his foot.' This is a *ḥadīth qudsī* and this closeness

is known as closeness of supererogatory works. The first closeness is the closeness of obligatory works because the root is the Being of God which is necessary and an obligation, and the supererogation is the being of the immanence which is the branch. In the case of the prophet Khalil, both considerations are possible, but the word *khalīl* is active, means the actor, and it is preferable to consider Abraham as the *mutakhallal* of the Divine Presences at the beginning of his following (*sulūk*) because it is the degree of closeness of supererogatories and Khalil is in accordance with the meaning of acted-upon, and that God was *mutakhallal* of the image of Abraham and his being is more suitable to be considered in the middle and latter part of his following because this is the degree of the closeness of obligations which is more complete, more total, more prevalent and larger than the closeness of supererogatories. The person of the closeness of supererogatories is a lover. His following (*sulūk*) is before attraction, and his annihilation comes before his persistence. His qualities are annihilated (*fānī*) and his 'ayn remains and God reveals Himself to him through the Name Interior (*bāṭin*), and God is the underlining of his comprehension. The person of the closeness of obligations is beloved, and his following (*sulūk*) is through Divine attraction, and his following is after his attraction, and his remaining passes beyond his annihilation. His being and qualities are annihilated. God reveals Himself to him through the Name Manifest (*ẓāhir*) and he is the underlining of the comprehension of the revealed God. Thus it is the servant who is God's hearing, sight and other powers. The Prophet said: 'God indeed said with the tongue of His servant: "God heard he who has praised Him. This is the hand of God. You did not throw when you threw, but God threw."' Here the throwing hand is Mohammed's, and God, having denied the throwing from Mohammed, established it for Himself, that is to say, it is God who threw with the place of manifestation which is Mohammed.

After that, if the Ipseity were devoid of these relationships It would not be a Divinity, and these relationships were brought about there by our potentialities. This means that at the degree of Divinity the Divine Qualities and creatural relationships are the necessities of the Divine Ipseity, and the degree of Divinity is dependent on the

Divine relationships, and the Divine relationships are dependent on the potentialities. If the Divine Ipseity were devoid of these relationships, like Divinity and Lordship etc., It would not have been a Divinity. Yet, it is our *a'yān* that brought about this relationship. In other words, the Existent Ipseity is not the Absolute Ipseity where It is particularized in the degree of Divinity. That is why It would not be a Divinity if It was free of the Divine relationships which are the necessities of that degree, in which case It would have been the Absolute Ipseity. However, in that degree the Ipseity cannot be free of these relationships because the Divine Names and Qualities and relationships of Lordship are the necessities of that degree and depend in reality on the creatural relationships, because Divinity, Lordship, creating, nourishing and other Divine relationships, are in reality qualifications and their existence is relationship and qualification. Thus Divinity is realized through there being somebody to establish it as Divine (*ma'lūh*), and in the same way Lordship is realized through there being somebody to establish it as such (*marbūb*). The Ipseity which is not transcended from these relationships is the Existent Ipseity which is particularized in the degree of Divinity, and this Ipseity is not that Ipseity which is Essentially Rich beyond Need (*ghaniyy*), because that one, by the absoluteness of Its Essentiality, is Rich beyond Need of the universes as well as of the Divine Names and the relationships of Lordship. The Absolute Ipseity is Rich beyond Need of Name or image or praise or qualification or being determined upon by anything. The realization of Divinity for the Ipseity is the manifestation of the Ipseity in the degree of the First *ta'ayyun* with all the determinations of Essential Unknowableness or particularizations of the Essential Unknowableness, together with the Divine and creatural relationships. However, if the Ipseity were devoid of Divine and creatural relationships It would have been the Absolute Ipseity and would not have been called the Divinity. Yet, for the purposes of manifestation and manifesting, and for the completion of revelation and revealing, it is necessary that the degree of Divinity should be established for the Ipseity. And we have, through our establishing of Divinity (*ma'lūh*), brought about the Divinity. And we have, through our establishing of Divinity, brought about the Divine to be

a Divinity. In other words, that the Ipseity be qualified by the quality of Divinity and called by the Name God is through our *ma'lūhiyya*. Had our external potentialities not been in the position of an establisher of Divinity (*ma'lūh*), the Ipseity would not have been called God. Consequently, the realization of Godhead is through our establishing a Divinity. This is so because Divine relationships are the necessities of the Ipseity of Godhead. No relationship can be realized unless it be between two things that are related: Between Divinity, Lord, Creator, that which establishes Divinity (*ma'lūh*) and that which establishes Lordship (*marbūb*) and the creature, are realized the relationships of Divinity, Lordship and Creatorship. Consequently, the realization of the Divine relationships is established through the potentialities of creaturality, and it is the potentialities of creaturality which manifest them. Now, what is meant by the potentialities is this, that whether the potentialities are considered potentialities of exterior existence, or they be considered potentialities of the unknowable, they have no existence by separate and independent existence outside the existence of Truth.

And in this last quote of the Shaykh: 'And we have, through our establishing of Divinity, brought about the Divinity', it is inferred that Divinity is brought about by our *a'yān*, and there seems to be a necessity for digression from the truth. However, there is no digression in the words of a complete gnostic. It is perhaps rather that the establishment of the potentialities of the Divine Unknowableness (*ghayb*) is through the revelation of the Divine Ipseity so that the Divine Ipseity is revealed in the mirrors of the potentialities by virtue of the potentialities, and these revelations are in accordance with the potentialities of non-existence. In the same way, the manifestation and revelation of the potentialities of existence in the exterior is again that of the Existent Ipseity by virtue of the potentialities. Perhaps rather that being conditioned in the potentialities by virtue of the potentialities, the one who speaks the words: 'And we have, through our establishing of Divinity, brought about the Divinity' from the places of manifestation of potentialities, is again the Truth Itself. Thus, bringing about or being brought about is between the Divine relationships.

It is not known until we are known. The Envoy of God, peace and praise be upon him, said: 'He who knows his self knows his Lord', and he (the Envoy) is the most gnostic of God in the creation. Thus, Divinity cannot be known as a Divinity as long as we are not known. That is why the Envoy said: 'If a person knows himself, in fact he knows his Lord', and thus the person who is most gnostic of God among the creatures, that is, the Envoy, relegated the knowledge of the Lord to the knowledge of the self, thus making the knowledge of the Lord dependent on the knowledge of the *nafs*, and that the gnosis of the Lord is consequent to the gnosis of the creature, because Lordship is established by that which acknowledges the Lordship. Lord is only known by there being one that acknowledges Him as Lord. One of the two things qualified cannot be known except by the other. That is why the Envoy made the knowledge of the Lord dependent upon the one that knows the Lord. The mentioning of this *ḥadīth* here is not for the purpose of explaining the knowledge of the Lord by the knowledge of the *nafs*. It is only for the purpose of explaining that the fact that the Ipseity should be called both by the Names of Divinity and Lord is dependent upon the one who qualifies Him as Divine and the one who regards Him as Lord. The necessities of how the knowledge of the Lord is through the knowledge of the self is mentioned in another place.

Some of the wise people and Abu Hamid have mentioned that God is known without looking at the universe, and this is wrong. In fact, some of the wise people like Abu 'Ali and his followers, and Abu Hamid who is the Imam Mohammed Ghazali, have maintained that God is known without looking at the universe, and this assertion of theirs is wrong. The fact that something is known as Divinity is dependent upon the universe (which is the *ma'lūh*) which is that which establishes it as Divinity, because Divinity cannot be realized without it being established by those who regard it as Divinity. Consequently, knowledge of God by virtue of His Divinity is dependent upon consideration of the universe, and the Divine signs shine in the horizons and in the selves. The High said: 'And We will show them Our signs in the horizons and in themselves until it becomes apparent to them that that is God, the Truth.' The *ḥadīth qudsī* says: 'I was a hidden

treasure and loved to be known, and I created the creation so that I be known.' Thus the universe, which is other than God, is created for the purpose of knowing God, yet it is known in general that the Absolute Ipseity, which is Ancient and Eternal, is Rich beyond Need of the universes. That is why the Shaykh added: Yes, it is known that the Ipseity is Ancient and Eternal, but it is not known that He is Divinity unless that which gives evidence to it (*ma'lūh*) is known, and that is its proof. But it is not known that the *dhāt* is the Divinity if the one that establishes Divinity is not known. Hence, the establisher of the Divinity is a proof and guide to the Divinity. Thus the knowledge of God by His Divinity is dependent upon looking at the universe, because the degree of Divinity collects in itself all the Divine Names and Qualities of Lordship, and Names and Qualities cannot be particularized and realized except through places of manifestation. Thus, the establishment of Divinity and Lordship for the Ipseity is dependent upon the *ma'lūh* which establishes Its Divinity, and *marbūb* which establishes Its Lordship. Yet the Essential Being of God is absolutely not dependent on anything, because the Truth (*ḥaqq*), as concerns Its Ipseity, is Rich beyond Need of the universes and the Divine Names.

Further, after this, in the second state, insight and intuition (*kashf*) bestows on you that indeed Truth Itself is the same as that which is the evidence for Itself and Its Divinity. This is to say, after the Divinity is known and established by that which establishes it and proves it (that is, the *ma'lūh*), in a second state which follows, which is the station of collectivity, He bestows upon you the insight that in fact the Truth Itself is the same as that which proves Itself and Its Divinity. That is to say, when one looks at the reality of that which establishes the Divinity (*ma'lūh*), the intellectual existence of that which establishes the Divinity is, in the first place, in its established potentiality through the revelation of the Ipseity with the Most Holy Self. In the second place, its potential being is through the revelation of the Names and Qualities. What insight (*kashf*) bestows is this, that the *nafs* of the *ḥaqq*, that is to say, His revealing Himself in the potentiality of that which establishes His Divinity through His Essential revelation, is that which is the proof of His Ipseity, or equally, His *nafs*

which is manifested absolutely in the mirror of that which establishes His Divinity, which becomes relative by virtue of that which establishes it, is proof for His *nafs* which is absolute, and of His Divinity, which is the degree of collectivity. In fact, the universe is not except (that it is) His revelation in the images of His established potentialities, and it is impossible that their existence be without that. Also, insight is bestowed upon you that in fact the universe is not other than the revelation of the *ḥaqq* in the images of the established potentialities of the singularities of the universe, so that it is impossible to imagine their existence without revelation in the images of the mirrors of the potentialities, or it is impossible to imagine the intellectual existence of the established potentialities which are established in the Presence of Knowledge through Divine revelation, without that revelation. (Thus, according to the first aspect the pronoun 'their existence' may refer to the word 'images', and the second aspect is that it may refer to the *a'yān-i-thābita*.) Thus, when the universe is the revelation and manifestation of the *ḥaqq* in the images of the established potentialities, the evidence (*dalīl*) of the universe to the *ḥaqq* becomes the evidence of the *ḥaqq* to His own *nafs*. Nevertheless, the potentialities are all the same established upon their non-existence, and they are the images of the revelation by virtue of the potentialities of what is reflected in the mirrors of the potentialities, or equally they are the images of the established potentialities manifested in the mirror of revelation which are relative by virtue of being potentialities. That which the second insight (*kashf*) has bestowed is the images of the potentialities in the mirror of revelation.

And He (that is to say, the *ḥaqq*) verifies Himself and multiforms Himself by virtue of the realities of these potentialities and their states. Equally, insight bestows on you that in fact God becomes varied and of different images by virtue of the realities and the states of these potentialities, and by virtue of the realities and the states of these established potentialities He becomes varied in revelation and manifests in different images and is imaged in different appearances. In other words, what is manifest and observed in the images of the potentialities in different images by virtue of the potentials is again the Being of the *ḥaqq*, and that the established potentialities are again

established according to non-existence. And this is after knowledge of Him by us that He is indeed the Divinity to us. That is to say, the coming about of the insight is after and resultant from the knowledge given to God from us that He is our Divinity and that we have known that God's Self is the evidence (*dalil*) to Himself and that the universe is the revelation of the *ḥaqq* in the images of the established potentialities, and that the *ḥaqq* is variously manifested through the states and realities of the potentialities, in other words, after the knowledge that the *ḥaqq* is our Divinity, that is to say, after we have known ourselves as the one that establishes the Divinity and the Lord, and that we have known the *ḥaqq* to be the Divinity and the Lord. Whenever a person knows his *nafs* and knows that his self is temporary and is dependent upon the Divinity and the Lord during its existence, and that he exists by His existence, it becomes clear to him by insight that the existence of all things and the observance of the universes is due to His revelation by virtue of the potentialities in the images of the established potentialities. Perhaps rather that the existence of the universes is the revelation of God in the images of potentialities which are revealed in the mirrors of the potentialities. Also, that our potentialities are according to eternal non-existence, and that which is manifest and existent in our places of manifestation and witnessed in the images that we mirror is the existence of God. Finally, from the aspects of absoluteness and relativity God's Self is proof and evidence of Its own Self. Then He gives the last of the insights (*kashf*) and shows you images in Him. This last insight (*kashf*) arrives in the station of remaining after annihilation, and distinguishing after collectivity. In this He shows to you our images in His revelation and you will witness our existences in the mirror of God. A difference is also possible with the letter *tā'* instead of the letter *yā'* (*fa-taẓhar* instead of *fa-yazhar*) in which case it would mean: and He would show you the images in God due to this insight. And some of us are shown to some others in God, and some of us know some others, and some of us are differentiated from some others. Thus, in the mirror of the *ḥaqq* some of us appear to some others, some of us know some others, and some of us are distinguished from some others. In the mirrors of our established potentialities which are in the state of

non-existence and annihilation in the station of collectivity and the Presence of Uniqueness, at the level of the revelation of the Ipseity, the images of our potentialities are manifested in the revelation of God. Thus, while we were according to oneness in the Uniqueness, some of us are manifested to others of us in the mirror of God, and when some of us were ignorant of some others of us with the ignorance of non-existence, some of us come to know some others of us with God's existence while we were in the oneness in the Uniqueness, and some of us become differentiated from some others of us through the particularities of the Ipseity. The extension of the revelation of the Ipseity over the established potentialities is equal but becomes branched differently due to the revelation of the potentialities, and then manifests. Thus the varied manifestation of the images of the potentialities in the revelation of the *ḥaqq* is because of the particularities of the potentialities.

Now, the first degree of manifestation and distinction is the First *ta'ayyun* and the Presence of Knowledge, where in the Divine Knowledge distinction results through the essential particularities among the potentialities, and through the determinations of essential relationships and qualifications there comes about knowledge, or through lack of relationship there comes about denial. The knowledge and denial which exists in the universe of spirits is the result of mutual correspondence and knowledge and mutual opposition and denial which is in the Presence of Knowledge; so much so, that the mutual knowledge and denial which is in the Presence of Witnessing is the result of the mutual knowledge and denial which exists in the universe of spirits. And also the last aspect is this, for which the Shaykh said what he said above, because what is witnessed at the level of the first insight is the existence of God in the mirror of the established potentialities which are in non-existence in the Ipseity of God, and they are not manifested potentialities because they are in non-existence, so that when one looks at the image which is manifested on the surface of the mirror one does not witness the mirror. However, in the second insight the images of the potentialities are manifested in the mirror of the *ḥaqq* and the *ḥaqq* is hidden in His Essential Richness-beyond-Need. That is why the Shaykh noted with the words: 'And some of us

are shown to some others in God', because the Essential revelation does not extend over the totality of the established potentialities. It extends over some of them, and the others effectively remain in the Ipseity of the *ḥaqq*. Their images are not manifested, and the images that are manifested in relation to the images that are not manifested are some. In the same way, the manifesting of the images that are reflected in the mirror of the *ḥaqq* to some he (the Shaykh) accepts with the word 'some'. This is because the 'eyes' of some of the images which are manifested and seen in the mirror of God are not yet opened so that they could comprehend the totality of some that have been manifested. Thus, those which comprehend are some of the images which are manifested. That is why he conditioned his speech with the words 'in God', because the conquering Light of the Ipseity is an obstacle to witnessing by others. Only those who are less than less of the heirs of Mohammed, who are the same as the *ḥaqq*, by whom the *ḥaqq* looks at the universe and bestows mercy upon it, only those who are manifested in the Ipseity of the *ḥaqq* with the Being of God, witness the images of the potentialities and consider thus the plurality in the oneness. Equally, he conditioned his saying with the words 'some of us know some others', because after some of us have manifested to others of us, some of us, under the conquering Light of Awe and Majesty, remain lost in praise and adoration (*muḥaymin*) and do not comprehend anything other than the *ḥaqq*. Consequently, gnosis and comprehension remains particular to some of us who are manifest and who are not lost in adoration and praise. Some, on the other hand, know that between these two there is established a predication of relationship, and he points with the words 'and some of us are differentiated from some others' to the fact that some of us are manifested to some others of us, so that after some of us have known some others of us, some of us become distinguished from some others of us in knowledge and become more elevated and more total in knowledge, and equally, some of us become consequently distinguished from some others through knowledge or ignorance. That is why he said: And of us there are who know that in fact this knowledge came to us in God from us, and of us there are some who are ignorant of that Presence wherein happened to come to us this

knowledge from us, and I take refuge in God from being of the ignorant. This means that in the second insight there are some from among our images of possibilities which are manifested in the mirror of the Truth who know that in the universe of senses that this knowledge in fact came to us in God because of what our potentialities bestowed on us. And there are some of us from among our possible beings who are ignorant of the Presence of the Divine Knowledge where, in that Presence, this knowledge came to us through what our essential particularities bestowed upon us. Thus the Shaykh says that he takes refuge in God from belonging to that category of people who are ignorant of that Presence of Knowledge. That is to say that our established potentialities are distinguished one from the other, having been particularized through Essential revelation in the Presence of Knowledge in the Being of the *ḥaqq*. Thus, our *a'yān* of being which are our established potentialities and their states are particularized with the particularization of knowledge in the Presence of Divine and Essential Knowledge. Thus some of us, becoming distinguished from some others, came to know that that knowledge is also bestowed on us because of the particularities of our essentialities. Then we follow according to the Divine law and Mohammedian plan in the universe of senses and of witnessing, and thus, having attained to the Presence of the *a'yān-i-thābita* and Divine Knowledge, we come to know by taste at the level of the second insight and revelation of perfection that our knowledge which was in the established is resultant to us in the Being of the *ḥaqq* and the Presence of the Essential Knowledge because of the bestowal of the particularities of our essentialities. This knowledge is essential knowledge. It is not outside the existence of the *ḥaqq*, for instance like the images which are particularized in the mirror, which are particularized on the surface of the mirror but are inexistent and unknowable in the exterior. However, the essential particularity of each potentiality is by virtue of its particularization in the Being of the *ḥaqq*, just like the two images of which the one that is reflected inside the mirror is due to its particular image which is outside it.

At the level of the first insight the Being of God is manifested in the mirrors of the potentialities by virtue of the potentialities, and equally

the established potentialities are manifested in the Being of the *ḥaqq* due to their special essentialities and not manifested by virtue of the *ḥaqq*. Some of us are ignorant of the Presence of Essential Knowledge which is the place of Divine knowledge and gnosis of images of knowledge. The cause of the ignorance of some is either lack of aptitude of essential particularities in the Divine Knowledge which he does not even know, and he is not inclined to knowledge, or else it is due to his branching out once he has reached the immanential degrees and consequent to his being annihilated under the distractions of nature and bodily qualities and his addiction to lower vibrations and because of his lack of reaching up to the established potentialities. Consequently, these, because of their ignorance of the Presence of Knowledge, cannot observe the images of the established potentialities in the Being of the *ḥaqq*. They are veiled by creaturality from the *ḥaqq*, and they do not observe the creaturality in the *ḥaqq*, nor the *ḥaqq* in the creaturality, and they observe nothing other than the plurality of the images of creaturality. These are the people of *jalāl* who are veiled from the *ḥaqq* and banished from His door. Those who are at the level of the first insight observe the *ḥaqq* in the established potentialities. Thus they are the people of Beauty (*jamāl*) who are veiled from the awe and majesty and anger (*jalāl*) by Beauty, and by the *ḥaqq* from the immanence, and they are the great enraptured ones who remain in the essential transcendence and in the potentiality of the collectivity of Uniqueness where the Awe and Majesty (*jalāl*) of the Beauty (*jamāl*) has enraptured them. At the level of the second insight are those who witness the images of the established potentialities in the Being of the *ḥaqq* and the immanence in the *ḥaqq*. Thus, those who are not veiled by the *jalāl* from the *jamāl*, or by the *jamāl* from the *jalāl*, or with the immanence from the *ḥaqq* or with the *ḥaqq* from the immanence, are people of completion who observe the *ḥaqq* in the immanence and the immanence in the *ḥaqq*, and they are not veiled by one from the other. With these two insights together, He does not determine over us except by us; perhaps rather we determine over us by ourselves, but in Him. And with the two insights together, the *ḥaqq* does not determine over us except with us; perhaps rather we determine over us by ourselves but we determine in the *ḥaqq*. In other

words, it is not God who determines over us by these two insights in this world or the other, whether we are in happiness or in difficulty, by retrograding or advancing, or lacks or completion. He determines over us with the essential particularities of our own established potentialities and what they necessitate, and with the determinations which our own established potentialities have bestowed. What the first insight bestows is this: the manifestation and revelation of the *ḥaqq* in various images in the mirrors of the potentialities through the essential particularities and original aptitudes of our established potentialities. Thus the revelation of God is in consequence of the place wherein it is revealed, which is the potentialities. What the second insight bestows is this: the manifestation of the images of the established potentialities as necessitated by the potentialities in the mirror of the Being of the *ḥaqq*. What the two insights together bestow is this: the *ḥaqq* did not determine over us from all eternity in accordance with our established potentialities, and forever over our existential potentialities, except with one determination from among all determinations which was in accordance with our receptivity and aptitude, and by that which we have asked of Him through our aptitude. This determination is through the Mystery of *qadar* (apportioning of fate), or equally with what we determine over Him with which He determines over us. Perhaps rather we determine over our own potentialities with what our potentialities give us of determination. We are the essential matters and the images of the relationships of His Knowledge, and we determine with the necessities of our potentialities over our own selves in the Being of the *ḥaqq*, and again this determining is through the Mystery of *qadar*. It is because of this that God said: 'To God is the most eloquent superiority in the argument', that is to say, concerning the ones that are veiled when they say to God: 'Why did You do to me like this or like that?' when things are disagreeable to their intents. Because of this, God the High said: 'And to God is the most eloquent superiority in the argument.' This means, where the veiled ones are concerned there is the most eloquent and perfect proof in the argument established for God that they have not witnessed the order as it is when they say to God: 'Why did You do like this or like that to us?', and consider these as disagreeable to

their aims and intentions. In other words, when they are reprimanded in response to acts in this world with that which is visited upon them as disagreeable or difficult, they say: 'Why do You punish us like that, because nothing has emanated from our actions in this world which was not from all eternity what You had seen as suitable? Thus, what in all eternity was fated to come about in us and emanate from us having been determined by You, and when the necessities of that determination emanate from us in this world, to reprimand us and punish us in response to such things is oppression to us.' Thus when the people of veils argue, there is established for God the most eloquent superiority in the argument and the most decisive blow, and He shows them from the trunk (of the matter) and this is the order into which the gnostics from among us have the insight. Hence, when such words emanate from them, then God the High gives them *kashf* from the 'trunk'. (In another verified copy it says 'from the trunk of the order'.) The 'trunk' of a thing is the knowledgeable image of the established potentiality which is individuated in the Divine Knowledge. Consequently, God does not determine over us except by virtue of the image of our receptivity of the knowledge of us in all eternity and by virtue of the aptitude of the knowledgeable image. The opening of the trunk is special for the people of veils in the other world, but the gnostics who are already in this world in accordance with the other open up the trunk in this world and witness the order. And they (the people of veils) see that in fact God (did not do anything) to them, that indeed He enacted only that which they have asked for, (and they see) that this is from themselves. In other words, God did not oppress them that they should argue that God oppressed them, and finally they witness that indeed the action was from themselves. In fact, the action which is passed over them from God and the action that took place is by virtue of what they necessitated and not enforced by God. In short, the effusion of revelation from God is in accordance with the aptitude of things, and the passing of a determination and the manifesting of an action is of the necessities of that aptitude. What the Shaykh, God be pleased with him, has said in this last phrase is what is understood from what God the Most High has said: 'And God did not oppress them but they were oppressors of

their own selves', and this Quranic *āya* was brought down to refute the arguments of those who are veiled. And indeed He (God) did not know of them except in accordance with what they were in *Ilm*. This means that God did not know them except in accordance with that knowledgeable image, by which image they are established in the Presence of Knowledge in the Being of the *ḥaqq*. In fact, God does not determine over them except by that determination which they have demanded from God in accordance with their aptitude. In other words, they have determined over God, by which determination they wanted the *ḥaqq* to determine over them. Perhaps rather, as it has been said, they determine in the Being of the *ḥaqq* over their own selves. Thus their argument becomes invalid and there remains the eloquent superiority in the argument for God. They argue that their actions are decreed by God, and God argues that: 'My Decree is subject to My Ability, and My Ability is subject to My Order, and My Order is subject to My Knowledge, and My Knowledge is the consequence of how you are known.' Thus, for all eternity forever, the determination that is current over the creation is in consequence of and in accordance with the requirements of the aptitude of the creation. And if it were said, what is the use of His saying: 'If We wanted We would have guided them all', we would say, if there is the letter of avoidance it is for avoiding and He would not wish except that which is the order upon it. Thus, if you say as has been mentioned, if it is our own potentialities which determine over us and if God only effuses being according to the necessities of those potentialities, then what is the use of God saying: 'If He wanted He would have guided them all', because God has relegated the guidance to His own way of being (*mashī'a*), then we would say, the proposition '*law*' is a letter of avoidance which would mean that God's way of being (*mashī'a*) did not appertain to that thing upon which there was the proposition of avoidance. The proposition of avoidance was placed there to show that it would cause the avoidance of the latter possibility and the sentence would then be: had God wanted to guide them all He would have guided, but His knowledge was that all did not have the inclination to being guided so that He guide them all. Consequently, the avoiding proposition was included into the manner of

being (*mashī'a*) because of the avoidance of guidance in some, which means that the guiding of all became avoided due to the avoidance which appertained in that thing. In short, that the thing avoided it being the guidance of all was due to the lack of aptitude in all to guidance. That all should be guided cannot happen and must be avoided because some are receptive of guidance and some are not. Thus, the coming about of the guidance of all is rendered impossible. Thus the impossibility of the guidance of all is due to the impeding of guidance in them by the lack of the *mashī'a* in them. The lack of the manner of being (*mashī'a*) of all where guidance is concerned is pointed out by the lack of bestowal to God by their potentialities of wanting to be led. Thus, the (required) manner of being did not appertain except to that upon which the order of guidance was established, and in the case of that receptor his aptitude is what his potentiality has bestowed to God. Yet, in the determination of the guiding of the intellect the potentiality of the possible is receptive to a thing or not. Of these two intellectual determinations, whichever determination results, that determination is for such an order according to which God's Knowledge was at the state of its establishment. However, in the matter of the determination of the guiding of the intellect the 'ayn of the possible is receptive both to a thing and to its refutation, and of the two intellectual determinations, whichever determination takes place, that determination is this order where the possible was established upon that state at the time of the establishment of it in the Divine Knowledge. Consequently, at the level of the guiding of the intellect that which results from one of the two intellectual determinations is that determination to the resulting of which appertains the manner of being (*mashī'a*), and the manner of being does not appertain except to the determination which is at the state of the establishment of the possible in accordance to which that possible was established. Thereby the manner of being (*mashī'a*) cannot appertain to the other determination which is its refutation. This is because the possible is established at the state of its being established in the Divine Knowledge. This is because in reality the essence of a thing and its refutation cannot necessitate one and the same determination. And the intellect is veiled from observing the reality of an order as that order is.

The meaning of: 'He would have guided you' is that He would have made it clear to you (the reality of the order as it is in itself), but God did not open the eye of vision of all the possibles to comprehend in which way the order is established in itself. Consequently, some of them are knowledgeable and some of them are ignorant, which means that the meaning of the words: 'He would have guided you' is that He would have made it clear to you, that is to say, if God's *mashī'a* had appertained to it He would have guided you all, which means that upon whichever thing the order was established at the state of its being established in the Divine Knowledge, God would have made that clear to you. However, God did not open the eye of *baṣīra* of all the possibles in the universe so that they comprehend the order which is according to that thing upon which the order is established in itself. Thus, some of them are knowledgeable and some of them are ignorant. And God did not wish, and He did not guide them all. He did not want to. Thus God did not wish and He did not guide all of them, that is, the Divine manner of being did not appertain in the past eternity to the guidance of all, and it will also not in the future eternity ever, because the Divine Knowledge did not appertain to the guidance of all due to the aptitude and the lack of receptivity of all to guidance. Consequently, He did not guide all, but only those who knew and had the aptitude. Equally, some who have not the aptitude are left to remain in the darkness of being misled and in the valley of hell. As God is in a different business, a different manner of being, every day, it is necessary that the Divine news be equally different, and the aptitudes of the potentialities are also varied. The aptitude of the potentialities is a specific state. It is not brought about by a cause that brings it about, because the potentialities are the places of manifestation of Names and Qualities in the Divine Knowledge, perhaps rather that they are the same as the orders of the Qualities and the Leader Names which are present through His Ipseity, and further, perhaps even that they are the same as the Ipseity of God by virtue of their annihilation in the Ipseity of God in reality. In the state of the establishment of all the potentialities in the Divine Knowledge, their relationship to the Ipseity is the same as the relationship of the Ipseity to all the potentialities, and in relation to the Ipseity the

manifestation of one of them is not prior to the manifestation of the other. The Being which collects in Itself the oppositions is manifest with the oppositions, like the First and the Last, the Interior and the Manifest, the Beautiful and the Majestic and Awesome, and the Guide and the Misleader. Thus, the *mashī'a* appertains to the guidance of those potentialities which bestow guidance, and equally, misleading to those potentialities which necessitate misleading. And indeed 'if He wanted' is in the same way. Here 'if He wanted' refers to God's words: 'If He wanted He could destroy you and bring about a new creation.' The Shaykh compares this 'if He wanted' to the 'if He wanted' above-mentioned, the only difference being grammatical, in that the letter *yā'* at the beginning of the word '*yasha*' denotes a future conditional. Thus the condition of the impossible has entered the *mashī'a* because of the avoidance of the removals, and their removals became impossible because of the refractoriness of the *mashī'a* to the removals. And would He want? In this case it is a negative conditional question, which means that how could the Divine manner of being (*mashī'a*) appertain to the guidance of all in the future infinity without the totality of the potentialities having bestowed guidance in the past eternity? Which again means that it was prevented and avoided, and the Divine manner of being does not appertain to a thing which is prevented or avoided. Such a thing does not happen, which means that God's manner of being (*mashī'a*) does not appertain to the guidance of all, which does not happen. In other words, it is prevented. And His *mashī'a* is a (single) unique appertaining. Thus, the *mashī'a* of God to all the knowledge is a unique appertaining, that is to say, the manner of being of the Ipseity appertaining to the totality of the Divine Knowledge and its relationship is in accordance with His Uniqueness, which Uniqueness is the quality of the Ipseity, and this relationship emanates from the Uniqueness of the Ipseity, and its relationship to all knowledge is the same. However, each thing known, in accordance with the aptitude of its essence, takes its particular portion from that one manner of being which is the revelation of the Ipseity. Thus, in accordance with the portion of each thing known, the one and the same appertaining becomes varied. Equally, in the determination of intellectual guidance it

appertains to only one determination which is necessary for it at the time of its being established from the two intellectual determinations. It does not appertain to the other determination which is its refutation. As the appertenance of the manner of being is according to the Uniqueness, it appertains only to one of the determinations of the two intellectual determinations in the thing known. And that (i.e. the way it is, the *mashī'a*) is a relationship subject to knowledge, and knowledge is a relationship subject to that which is known, and the known is you and your states. And *mashī'a* is a relationship which is subject to knowledge, and equally knowledge is a relationship subject to the known. However, it is so, that the known is you and your states. That is to say, *mashī'a* is subject to knowledge because whichever way one looks at it, it is not possible that will (*irāda*) and the *mashī'a* could appertain to something which is not known. That knowledge is subject to that which is known because the establishment of the known in the being of the knower can only be in respect of the particularized image of that which is known, and since what is known is you, that is to say, it is your state together with your established potentiality, and that this necessitates the existence of one of the two contrary propositions of the established potentiality, then of course the *mashī'a* must appertain to one determination. And in the Being of the *ḥaqq* and in the Divine Knowledge each of the established potentialities (*a'yān-i-thābita*), which are the Divine knowledges, becomes known to God in accordance with the predication that it has bestowed to God, and each thing known is established in the Knowledge of the *ḥaqq*, the Knower, in consequence of that thing's particular individuation, and knowledge therefore is subject to that particular individuation, just as the *mashī'a* is subject to knowledge. And there is not for knowledge an effect in that which is known. Rather, there is an effect in the knower for that which is known, and it bestows from its own self in whatever way it is in its own potentiality. This is to say that that which is known has an effect on the knower due to its bestowing upon him the image of its knowledge from its own self in the way that the thing known is established at the state in which it is established. Consequently, it is that which is known which bestows knowledge to the knower in the images of what is known to him, because the knower

cannot know the known except according to that image according to which the known is established. Consequently, knowledge is subject to that which is known, just as well as the *mashī'a* is subject to knowledge. The Divine address did not come except in consideration of what the ones that were addressed had bestowed upon Him and by virtue of what intellectual vision bestowed. This is an answer to a possible objection which might be brought about as: you say that the *mashī'a* is subject to knowledge, and knowledge is subject to that which is known, yet this might be in opposition to the Divine address because guiding or misleading are two contradictory determinations and to whatever determination God's *mashī'a* appertains, that thing happens. Thus he answers, saying that in these conditional quotes there is not Divine address except by virtue of that thing upon which those who were addressed were in agreement. And that is the intellect, and equally it is in consequence of that which the intellectual vision has bestowed and which is in relation to the completion of ability to do and will. Consequently, 'if He wanted He would have guided all' means He would have guided all the people if their state of being had appertained to that way of being, because acts, deeds, effects, are in consequence of if they are willed or not. In the same way, if the state of being had appertained to the complete destruction of the people of the creation, He would have done so. It was because they were lacking in their vision in consequence of what they apparently understood that the Divine address came to them in the language of that which was first understood. The address did not come in accordance with what insight bestowed. That is to say, the Divine address did not arrive according to what insight (*kashf*) bestowed. That is to say, it did not come in accordance with what it really bestowed so that the *mashī'a* would be subject to knowledge, and knowledge subject to what is known, and what is known is subject to that determination which is in its ipseity and according to which it is established. The knower bestows upon God and determines, so that with that special determination God may determine over him, in other words so that God's *mashī'a* appertain to him. That is why the address was made general and was not made according to the particular in the general or according to what insight bestowed. 'God does not propose to a

self more than its capacity', because those people of understanding who are contented with themselves according to what is apparently understood, cannot comply with or obey or listen to that which comes to them through a special language, and through a language which is more elevated, more appertaining, more totalizing and more perfect than that. They would have been necessarily disappointed, deprived or even debarred from what was meant as guidance and the order of guidance in the arrival of the Divine address, and it would have been useless and untoward to propose to them an action which would be beyond their capacity and their ability to bear. However, the Most Wise maker of the universe brought to them in accordance with His Wisdom in general language in accordance with what is understood as intellectual vision bestows, and He hid deep in the interior of it the Divine knowledges and the Mysteries of Decree (*qadā'*) and Apportioning of Fate (*qadar*) which insight bestows, so that each one of us, in accordance with our private aptitude, takes from it the determination that our own established potentiality bestows, and the people of appearances take from it according to their known manner the apparent determinations, and each of the people of interior knowledge takes from it in accordance with the capacity of reception and total comprehension consequent to what insight bestows. Like this, believers increased, and a small portion of gnostics are people of insight. That is, because the address came according to the language that the intellectual vision bestows and not according to what the *kashf* bestows, the believers became many and the gnostics who are the people of *kashf* became few, because in the degree of belief we are together with the totality of the believers in taking the address which arrived in accordance with what the vision of the intellect bestows, and it is easy to agree with the address which arrives in this way because it is a thing of appearances and it is easily possible to take from it with intellectual vision, which is the lowest and most apparent form of comprehension; and because there exists an aptitude in a small number of us to take in the manner that insight bestows that which is hidden in the interior of the address which came in the apparent manner, and to rise to the mysteries inside this address, only a small number of us gnostics are people of insight. It is also true that the majority of the

people are people of intellectual and theoretical vision, and that the Divine address came according to the comprehension of the ones addressed and did not come in the manner that insight bestows, since the general aptitude does not suffice for that. Consequently, the Divine address came down in accordance with the comprehension and intelligence of the ones addressed, thereby the believers became many, and gnostics few, because as the Divine order comes in accordance with the generality in consequence of the aptitude and comprehension of those addressed, the believers became many, and since to comprehend the order as it is and to have insight into it is above the comprehension of the intellect, there are fewer gnostics. And there is not anyone from among us who does not have his known place and that he is not therein, and which was not there at the time of your being established and in which your existence did not manifest. This means that from among us there is not one for whom there is not a known place, from which he does not exceed, and this known place, which is special to each one of us, is such a place that at the time of your being established therein in the Presence of Knowledge, whatever you were clothed with or established as in your being, you manifested in the exterior in that way. This is your known place. In other words, in whichever way you were established in the Presence of Knowledge, in your exterior being you are manifested in accordance with that, and you cannot exceed from that known centre or that known place. Therefore, if a person's station is according to knowing with the intellect, he cannot escape appearing according to its conditions, and if somebody's established potentiality bestows His Knowledge of the Mystery of the *qadar* through insight, he is manifested in that image and cannot oppose God through ignorance and will not be in opposition to what the *qadar* has regulated and want to change it. Now, for each variety of people, whether they be people of intellect or gnostics, and secondly, for each single person, there is a known station, place, which is in accordance with the thing he is established upon in the Divine Knowledge and with which he is manifested in the exterior being. Aside from this, because of the knowledge of the appertenance of the *mashf'a* at the time of the establishment in the Divine Knowledge, the Shaykh, God be pleased with him, brings

about this example as if it came from the language of the gnostic angels who are possessors of known stations, and addresses with these words from the language of particularized beings and known knowledges, and says that there is not a single individual from among our particularized existences for whom there is not a known station or place, and for each of us the coming about of our known station in the establishment of the Divine Knowledge is our manifestation in the exterior being. Because in the origin the known station is the image of everything's being known in the Divine Knowledge, according to which image that thing is known in God's Knowledge. Thus to manifest in the exterior being according to the establishment which was in the Divine Knowledge is through the Divine *mashī'a*, and this *mashī'a* does not apply except in accordance to the establishment which is in the Divine Knowledge. Yet, the particularities of the established potentialities which are in the Divine Knowledge are various. Consequently, the appertenance of the *mashī'a* is also varied. Thus, the Divine *mashī'a* did not apply to the guidance of all because the aptitudes of all are varied as each one has a known station and does not extend beyond that centrality. Consequently, the *mashī'a* does not apply to the guidance of a person who has not the aptitude to be guided. This is if it is indeed established that the being is in fact for you. This means that there will be an order of particularization for you to be manifested in the exterior existence in accordance with your establishment in the Divine Knowledge if it is established that in fact there will be existence for you and that you are qualified with being. This means, in other words, that if the Being of the *ḥaqq* were particularized by virtue of your potentiality in the mirrors of your established potentiality which was in annihilation, and if that image of knowledge were to be manifested in outer existence, then that known image which is manifested in the mirrors of your potentiality being conditioned by virtue of your potentiality, in accordance with these considerations it is established for you and it is attributed to you. And if it is established that in fact the being is for the *ḥaqq*, it is not for you, and the determination is yours without a doubt in the Being of the *ḥaqq*. This means that in accordance with what the first insight bestows, that the Being of the *ḥaqq* is manifested due to the

potentialities in the mirrors of the potentialities whereas the potentialities were in annihilation, thus if it is established that that which is particularized in the mirrors of the established potentialities and that which is manifested in sensible being by virtue of the particularization in the potentialities is for the particularization of the Being of the *ḥaqq* because the potentialities which are in annihilation are the mirrors and do not exist and are not visible, then without a doubt the determination in the Being of the *ḥaqq* is for you. This is so because your established potentiality through its essential speciality has bestowed upon the *ḥaqq*, which is manifested in your established potentiality, such a determination that the *ḥaqq* is manifested therein through that determination. The One Existence, due to Its Ipseity, is One, and that has no plurality. In the same way, revelation is equally according to oneness at the beginning of its manifestation from the Ipseity, whereas the multiplicity, plurality, differentiation, variety, which is in the Being of the *ḥaqq*, is due to the mirrors of the potentialities. Consequently, being becomes established for the *ḥaqq*, and determination for the *a'yān*. The potentialities are the annihilated Self, and the use of the words in the above quote from the Shaykh, may God be pleased with him: 'And if it is established . . .', is not due to a doubt in the knowledge of being, though yet the manners of beings and tastes are varied. Some of these establish being for the *ḥaqq* and witness the immanence in the *ḥaqq*. Some others establish being for the immanence and observe the *ḥaqq* in the immanence, and yet some others establish the *ḥaqq* through some aspects and the immanence through some aspects. And if it is established that you are existent, then the determination is for you without a doubt. This means that if it is established that in fact you are the existent due to your aptitude, with the effusion of the Light of being over your potentiality, then without a doubt the determination comes about for you because due to your aptitude you determine over the *ḥaqq*, which resultant determination then equally determines over your potentiality, and this aspect is according to what the second intuition bestows. This is so when the Being of the *ḥaqq*, due to the potentialities in the mirror of potentialities, manifests, and the images of the potentialities are manifested in the revelation of the *ḥaqq* due to the potentialities, and

the images of the potentialities thus become differentiated one from the other, then, under the consideration that you are existent with the Light of being which effuses over your potentiality, then, considering that the Being of the Absolute *ḥaqq* is conditioned in your potentiality, and if the determiner is the *ḥaqq*, there is no more for Him other than the effusion of existence over you, and the determination is yours over yourself. And if it is the *ḥaqq* who is determiner over you because He has given you being, then for the *ḥaqq* there is nothing of determination except the effusion of being. Then your determination over your *'ayn* is established because the *ḥaqq* determines over it with the determination that the particular inclination of your *'ayn* has bestowed upon the *ḥaqq*. If there is any objection to this from any possible angle, here the Shaykh, God be pleased with him, means that even if it is true that it is the *ḥaqq* who is determiner, all the same there is no determination for the *ḥaqq* other than the determination of the *ḥaqq* for the effusion of being over your potentiality, and the determination is established for your potentiality which the private aptitude of your potentiality has bestowed upon God, and he (that person) says: 'Determine over me with this determination', and determines over God. Thus, although the *ḥaqq* is the determiner under the consideration of the effusion of being over the potentialities, and that the *ḥaqq* determines over each of them with the special determination that each of the potentialities has bestowed to the *ḥaqq*, still, that which determines over the potentialities is the potentialities. And do not praise except yourself and do not blame except yourself. If your potentiality necessitates happiness and completion and thereby manifests with happiness and completion, then do not praise anything other than your own self because the light of your being arrives at you through your aptitude. Thus, whatever your potentiality has bestowed as determination upon the *ḥaqq* so that the *ḥaqq* determines over you with that same determination, then naturally the *ḥaqq* determines over you with that very same determination which has emanated from you in the first place. Thus praise yourself. And if your aptitude necessitates lack and misery and if lack and misery will manifest in you, do not blame anyone else other than your *nafs*. In the state of the establishment of the potentialities, if what is necessary

is guidance or misguidance, goodnesses or badnesses, even though the consideration of the effusion of being is all from God, the potentialities bestow upon the *ḥaqq* any one of these states which is of their necessities. Thus, all of that arrives from what the potentialities demand. Thus, there becomes established for God most evident proof that His manner of being and action is in consequence of the specific ipseity of the potentialities, whether these be for the potentialities a need for good or for ill. In short, God manifests by effusion of being over the potentialities through the determination which is in the power of the potentiality. Consequently, if there is oppression which results, it is from the creature and not the *ḥaqq*. There does not remain for the *ḥaqq* anything other than praise for the effusion of being, because that is indeed from Him, not from you, because the potentialities are in accordance with annihilation, consequently the effusion of being is not from you. Effusion of being is from the Presence of collectivity and from the station of oneness. What is established for you in absoluteness is the praise for the necessity of being and of manifestation, and in relativity the praise for the manifestation of completeness, because at the level of the manifestation of ill what applies to you is blame, and praise does not apply. However, this aspect of application does not diminish the fact that all praises refer to the *ḥaqq* in the words: 'Praise be to God', because the effusion of being is from the station of oneness, and the praises of completeness which refer to the potentialities again revert to the *ḥaqq*, because the potentialities are the places of detailing (*tafṣīl*) of the *ḥaqq*, and in reality the potentialities are no other than the *ḥaqq*. Thus, in totality and in detail all praise refers to God. And you are His nourishment by the determinations, which means that as the determination is established for you in being, then you are the nourishment of God with those determinations, because the Being of the *ḥaqq* manifested clothed in the images of the determinations of your established potentiality. Thus, the Being of the *ḥaqq* which is manifested in you on account of you is nourished through the images of your established potentiality and its determinations. The determinations of established potentiality are hidden in the Being of the *ḥaqq*, just as nourishment is hidden in the nourished, and the *ḥaqq* is manifest just as the one that is nourished

is manifest. And He is your nourishment by being. And God is nourishment for you with being, because you are manifest with existence even though in the manifested being of God, God remains hidden in the image of your established potentiality. Thus you are nourished by the Being of the *ḥaqq* and you are manifest, and the Being of the *ḥaqq* is hidden and interior. The transcendence of nourishment or the absolutizing of nourishment in this matter is in the way of a simile, because the potentialities are the causes of remaining of the manifestations of the determinations of being. Equally, the *ḥaqq* is the cause of the remaining of the beings of potentialities, exactly in the same way as nourishment is the cause of the remaining and presence and the manifestation of completeness of the one that is nourished. Just as nourishment is hidden in the one nourished, the potentialities through their determinations are the nourishment of the *ḥaqq*. The *ḥaqq* is manifest in the potentialities and the potentialities are hidden and passing away (*fānī*) in the *ḥaqq*. Thus the *ḥaqq* is the nourishment of the potentialities through being, because having manifested their potentialities He remains hidden in them. In short, the potentialities determine over the *ḥaqq* by their determinations, and the *ḥaqq* determines over the potentialities by being. That which particularized for Him, particularized for you. That is to say, in all eternity the determinations of the established potentiality particularized in God and God became the determined over and you became the determiner in the manifest existence as the determination became particularized from God for your being. Thus, in consequence of your being determined over, you became the nourishment of God through determination, just as the *ḥaqq* became your nourishment through being. The order is from Him to you and from you to Him. The order, that is to say, the determination, refers to you from the *ḥaqq* through His effusion of being over your potential. Thus the *ḥaqq* is the determiner over you, and you are the one that is determined over, and, at the same time, the determination from you is made to belong to the *ḥaqq* by bestowing upon the *ḥaqq* that special determination from your potentiality which was established in the state of its establishing in the Presence of Knowledge. Thus, both the *ḥaqq* and your potentiality, each through a different aspect, is the determiner, and is the

determined over through another aspect. Equally, the order refers to you from the *ḥaqq*, who orders you in things like: 'Pray to Me' etc., and other orders which arrive at the servant from the *ḥaqq*, and yet the order is also from you to the *ḥaqq*, where you order the *ḥaqq* like in saying: 'Lord, cover up my lacks' or 'Lord, help me.' It is equally so for the order which is in the image of a prayer, which again, as the order arrives to you from the *ḥaqq*, emanates from you to Him in the same way. There is no other (difference between you and God) than that you are the one who is called 'charged with the responsibility', but He did not charge you with a responsibility other than by which you said to Him through your state: 'Charge me', and with what you were upon, and God is not called the one that is charged with a responsibility. This is to say, there is no difference between you and the *ḥaqq* in this equality except that there is this much difference, that you can be called the one that has been charged with responsibility, but God did not charge you with any responsibility except through your state and in what way you were through your aptitude and receptivity when you said to Him: 'Charge me with this', and He charged you with that thing you asked him to through the language of your state, your aptitude and your receptivity. God is not called with the name of being the one that is charged with responsibility, because being charged with responsibility cannot befall Him. Thus, because the *ḥaqq* and the servant are both determined upon, the difference between them is this, that the servant can be called charged and the *ḥaqq* cannot be called charged.

**And He praises me and I praise Him, and He worships
me and I worship Him.**

This means the *ḥaqq* praises me because of my being the place of perfection for the width and breadth of my circle of being, and being the image of the Divine totality of the Ipseity, and because He is manifesting in me in the image of His Divinity without any change, appearing totally and in detail in me, and had I not been, the *ḥaqq* would not have been known and would not have been worshipped and praised and would not have manifested with the totality and the detail of manifestation, and there would not have resulted revelation

and revealing. Equally, I praise God because He made me according to the Divine Image and effused being upon me with the singularity of the *nafs-i-raḥmānī* from the interior of the First *ta'ayyun*, and for manifesting in me with the totality of perfection by bestowing the blessing of the Divine Image on me. And God worships me, that is to say, He obeys me when I ask Him to respond to me, and He responds to me, and I worship Him by concurring with His order and obeying Him in all the orders and by making myself indigent before the grandeur of the Singularity of His Ipseity. Another way of seeing this verse, where he says: 'He worships me and I worship Him', is this, that God worships me when together with the *nafs-i-raḥmānī* I became particularized in the degree of the First *ta'ayyun*, and thus having been particularized in the totality of Divine and immanental particularizations and in all the degrees and in all spiritual beings and in all manners of personality and corporeality I became manifested and made to be in the human image so that He arranged and maintained and prepared me to blow into me the Spirit of the image of Divine perfection, and equally I worship Him by manifesting Him with that image whereby I have received in that Divine and total image of perfection all the revelations of the Names of Ipseity.

Now, let it be known like this, that what is meant by worship is to bring about, and make and prepare and educate, and to respond properly in response. Thus the attribution of worship to God is not due to lack of good form. These words are not the words of drunkards. These are the words of the true and realized gnostic and the heir that has verified. The word of the gnostic is always in accordance with the order and origin of knowledge. In whatever manner or way words emanate from him they are necessarily in accordance with good form. However, it sometimes happens that certain words emanate from the gnostic in the form of words that emanate from people who lack in good form and people who doubt, but the determination of the gnostic is not like their determinations because the gnostic is observant of the complete circumference of the Ipseity and there is not a word in his place of witnessing which God will not accept, and there is not a qualification by which God does not manifest. Especially as this group of people in question have established a special terminology so

as to protect the Divine mysteries, just as others of people of science have each at their level established a terminology. Therefore, it is very necessary to refrain from attributing lack of good form through not properly understanding the terminology of this group of people, and from arguing against their perfections by attributing what they say to lack of good form.

**In a certain state I affirm Him, but in the potentialities
I negate Him.**

When I am under the domination of the station of total oneness I testify the oneness of the Being of the *ḥaqq* because I observe all things in annihilation in Him, and when I am under the dominion of plurality at the level of the vision of the immanence, when I look at the *a'yān* I negate Him when thus He is revealed from the latter potentialities wherein He is particularized and hidden.

**And He knows me and I deny Him, and I know Him
and I witness Him.**

God knows me in all states and manners because He encompasses all the established potentialities and all things latterly attached thereto, and when He reveals Himself in the images of latter things in the immanence and reveals Himself therein, I deny Him, because by virtue of His Essential oneness I transcend Him from numerality and plurality and I separate Him from the images of latter things. I witness Him in totality and in detail because knowledge and witnessing is of the necessities of my reality, and it is my reality which bestows upon me knowledge of Him and witnessing Him.

**How can He be beyond need of us when I help Him
and make Him happy?**

In what way can He be beyond need of us with all His Names and Qualities when I remunerate Him when all His Names and Qualities and revelations and perfections manifest in me? 'Indeed when you help, God helps you', and help is remuneration because Divinity is realized through servanthood. Equally I remunerate Him in the place of the manifestation of His perfection with deliberate goodness

through the effects of Lordship when the mysteries of His Divinity are manifested, because relationships of Names like Divinity, Lordship and Being, are dependent on the immanential potentialities such as the acceptance of their being a Divinity and a Lord. Thus, servanthood, by virtue of its servanthood, helps the *ḥaqq* in the realizing of His Names and Qualities, and in His manifesting with them and through them and manifesting them, and helps God to become manifest with the totality of His places of manifestation, and manifesting with all the relationships of Divinity, and also in the final maturity of the determinations of the Names, because the help given to the realities and the relationships of the Names, and their fulfilment, is through the manifestation of their effects in the places of manifestation. Consequently, God is not Rich beyond Need from us where it concerns the Names and Qualities.

**It is for this that God made me and thus I knew Him
and caused Him to become.**

It is for the purposes of being the place of manifestation for the manifestation of His Divinity and Lordship that He caused me to become, so that I help Him through my recognizing His Divinity and His Lordship, so that I come to know Him and have caused Him to become in knowledge in such an image where that image concords with that which God wishes. The words: 'It is for this . . . ' denote and refer to: 'I help Him . . . ', which means that He made me exist so that in the place of my manifestation His Names and Qualities manifest their determinations and effects, by which He becomes known and witnessed.

**And indeed the *ḥadīth* arrived to us, and His purpose
was therein realized.**

The *ḥadīth* referred to is the *ḥadīth qudsī*: 'I was a hidden treasure and I loved that I be known, and I created the immanence so that I be known.' The purpose of God became realized in me. That is to say, in my essence what He demanded was realized. That is to say, He became manifest and revealed in me with the total receptivity and the total place of manifestation in me. He became manifest and revealed

with His total and detailed manifestation, and I, having known Him with total knowledge, witnessed Him in my knowledge and manifested Him in accordance with my knowledge of witnessing.

When this degree by which he was called *khalīl* was (established) for the *khalīl*, upon him peace. When this awesome and majestic degree became established for the *khalīl* (S.A.) due to which he was called the *khalīl*, that is to say, when this degree became established for Abraham with all its expanse and aptitude and receptivity and all the Divine states with which God became manifest with the intimacy and fluency as of nourishment being fluent in all parts of the one nourished, and thus he became nourishment for God, in the same way God became nourishment for Abraham, peace be upon him, through the effusion coming from the Presence of the totality of the totality, which is the total collectivity of the singularity of the Self, and thus became intimate into the image of the being of Abraham and became fluent in all his degrees of being and powers and totality of realities. Thus is the law of hospitality, which means that Abraham, peace be upon him, established the law of hospitality and feasting, and because of this he gave nourishment to all wayfarers, arrivals and people present and all the created universe. And this state, that is to say, Abraham (S.A.) becoming intimate to the totality of the Divine stations and becoming nourishment for God with all the determinations, and equally, God becoming intimate with the totality of the realities and powers of Abraham and becoming nourishment for him with being, this state became dominant over Abraham, peace be upon him, and took effect outside of him whereby the mystery of the reality of his station became manifest and spread over his state, and his state became manifest in his acts and actions. Ibn Masarra al-Jibli brought him together with Michael (the Archangel Michael who is appointed) for nourishment. The mention of al-Jibli does not appear in all the copies. The verifier Shaykh Mohammed ibn Abdullah ibn Masarra al-Jibli of Cordova, God be pleased with him, brought together Abraham and Michael concerning nourishment. In certain copies it appears as 'together with Michael, ruler (*mālik*) over nourishment.' The Shaykh, may God be pleased with him, says in the 12th chapter of the *Futūḥāt* that Ibn Masarra al-Jibli was among the greatest of the

people of the Way, by his knowledge, by his state, and by *kashf*. In fact the Throne is carried by those who are rulers and they each are enclosed, that for the body, that for the spirit, and that for nourishment, and Adam and Israfil for images, and Gabriel and Mohammed for the spirits, and Michael and Abraham for nourishment, and Malik and Ridwan for promises and the things promised, and there is no other ruler than what we have mentioned. The Shaykh, may God be pleased with him, says about this in his abundance of intelligence: God brought about to this Throne eight who will carry it on the Day of Judgement, and of them four angels, one in the image of Israfil, the second in the image of Gabriel, the third in the image of Michael, the fourth in the image of Ridwan, the fifth in the image of Malik, the sixth in the image of Adam, the seventh in the image of Abraham, the eighth in the image of Mohammed, God praised him and *salām* over him, and these are the images of their interior meanings, not the images of their emergence. The nourishing of the nourished is by nourishment, and if the nourishment becomes intimately penetrating into the being of the one nourished there remains nothing except its intimate penetration, and indeed the nourishment is fluent in the totality of all parts of the one that is nourished. And the nourishing of those who are nourished is through nourishment. Consequently, exactly in the same way as the totality of the being of each of those who have been penetrated is intimately penetrated and it is intimately penetrated into the reality of the other by its totality of oneness, nourishment, with its reality, is fluent in all parts of the nourished. However, in that there is no portioning. There is no portioning in the Divine totality, but he has considered the parts of the one who is nourished as Names and Presence of Names in plurality. Without a doubt, when Abraham intimately penetrated all the stations of Divinity, where he is considered by the Names, therein manifested the Ipseity of the Exalted (Majestic and Awe-inspiring) and the High and Lofty. When Abraham, upon him be peace, became nourishment for God and intimately penetrated Him, without a doubt he intimately penetrated all the Divine stations where he is considered as the Names. Consequently, the Ipseity of the Exalted and the High became manifest in the place of manifestation which is Abraham with

all the Divine Names, and Abraham thus became the nourishment for the Names and is hidden in them and manifest by them. In the same way, the Ipseity of God is manifest in Abraham, and Abraham is hidden and interior in Him.

And we belong to Him as the evidence of our direction
established, and we belong to us,
And there is not for Him any other than my immanence,
and we belong to Him as also we belong to ourselves.
For me there are two aspects, He and I, and for Him
there is no I by I (me),
However, in me is His place of manifestation, and we
are to Him as if a vessel.

And we belong to Him as the evidence of our direction
established, and we belong to us.

That is to say, as our intellectual proof became established it became evident that the images of our potentialities are God's Qualities and that our realities are His Names and the relationships and happenings of His Ipseity, and our external beings are His Being. In the same way, as our proofs of insight became established it becomes evident that we are by virtue of our potentialities for the reality of our potentials. In other words, due to our external potentialities we are the images and the possessions of the realities that are established in the Unknowable. Consequently, that which is manifest in us and determines in us is only those.

Now, in accordance with that which the first insight bestows the images of knowledge of the Unknowable are the images of the *haqq* established in the mirrors of the potentialities. In accordance with what the second insight bestows we are the images of the potentialities which are manifested in the mirror of the *haqq*. Thus the relationship of our external images to those images of knowledge of the Unknowable is according to two aspects. One aspect is this, that we are, due to our witnessable potentialities and due to our manifest and existent nature and qualities, the images of the *haqq* which are manifested in the mirrors of our established potentialities, because,

in accordance with what the first insight bestowed. God became manifest in various images in the mirrors of the potentialities due to the potentialities. Thus, we, by our manifest beings, are the images of the *ḥaqq* which is manifested in the mirrors of our established potentialities. Consequently, the *ḥaqq* is manifest in our images and we are interior in Him and hidden. We are the nourishment of the image of the *ḥaqq* which becomes manifest in our images, because the presence of those images is through our being the places of manifestation. The other aspect is this, in accordance with what the second insight bestows, that when the Being of the *ḥaqq* was revealed to the established potentialities, that which becomes manifest in that revelation is the images of the potentialities which became manifest due to the potentialities in the image of the Being of the *ḥaqq*, and in those images the Being of the *ḥaqq* is interior and is their nourishment. Thus, if our exterior beings were to be considered in relationship to our established potentialities, then they would be their images. Consequently, we are the images of the images of our established potentialities with our nature, which means that our images from the *ghayb* are manifested in these, our exterior images, and that we are their nourishment and are hidden in them and we are their interior, because their being manifested at all and present is through our external images being their place of manifestation. Consequently, if we are the images of the Unknowable and the Being of the *ḥaqq* with our exterior beings, then with our essential reality we are His Names and relationships and happenings of His Ipseity. And the fact that we are this, is the best way.

And there is not for Him any other than my immanence,
and we belong to Him as also we belong to ourselves.

This means that there is no total place of manifestation for the *ḥaqq* other than my being, because He is manifested in me with total manifestation. Thus, we are for the *ḥaqq* because He manifests by us, and with His revelation He is in our manifestation, just as we are manifest with our realities and potentialities. That is to say, for the manifestation of the *ḥaqq* with the image of His Divine total Ipseity there is no other perfect place of manifestation and all-pervading place of

revelation other than me, that is to say, other than the Perfect Man, in which place of manifestation God could be manifest with Ipseity and Quality, and that at the same time that place of manifestation be hidden and interior in the *ḥaqq*. Our relationship to Him is through His being manifest through us, which is the same as our relationship to our realities which are being the places of manifestation in the images of knowledge, in the same way as that they become manifest through us and that we become the places of manifestation for them. In short, according to the first insight, the *ḥaqq* being manifest in our images, we are hidden in Him and are His nourishment, just as our potentialities of the unknown are manifest in our potentialities of being, so also as our potentialities of being, being nourishment to them, are hidden in them. According to the second insight the *ḥaqq* is our interior and is our nourishment, because our presence and being is by Him and we are manifest in Him by Him. Thus the *ḥaqq* is manifest by us, in us, and equally we also are manifest in the *ḥaqq* with the *ḥaqq*. Another way of seeing this is as follows: we are His possession and He determines over us with being, just as we are the possessions of our potentialities, where our potentialities determine over us. And the second line could be understood to say that there is no other nourishment for Him other than my being, or it could even be read as: there is no other (thing) for God than the effusion of being upon me, and that which determines over us is our potentialities. Under these considerations it would be:

For me there are two aspects, He and I, and for Him
there is no I by I (me).

Meaning that for me, that is, for the Perfect Man, there are two ways established: one is the quiddity of the interior by which Man is the *ḥaqq*, and this aspect is the Divine image which is his reality from the images of the *ḥaqq* which are manifested in the mirrors of the established potentialities, and he points at this aspect with the word 'Him'. As for the other aspect, it is the manifested nature and 'I'-ness by which Man is creature, and according to this aspect that which is manifest in the mirror of the *ḥaqq* is his image of the unknowableness which is due to the image manifested in the *ḥaqq* in the potential being. To this

aspect the Shaykh points with the word 'I'. Consequently, according to the first aspect there is no differentiation between our quiddity and the Absolute Essential Quiddity of the *ḥaqq* except the relative differentiation which is between the First *ta'ayyun* and *lā ta'ayyun*, because in that there is no apparent quality of servanthood and quality of Lordship. However, according to the second aspect there is differentiation, because the Quiddity being particularized by 'I'-ness two parts become apparent. One part is the portion of Lordship and the other is the portion of servanthood. Yet, there cannot be for God a relative 'I' because of His Holy and Absolute Quiddity, like there can be a relative us. Equally, perhaps, for that which is encompassed in our 'I'-ness is established for Him encompassing, prevailing and absoluteness. Or also that for me there are two aspects, one the interior quiddity and the other the apparent 'I'-ness, whereas for the manifestation of the 'I'-ness of the *ḥaqq* there is no word 'I' verbally and in reality except that the manifestation of His 'I'-ness in the potentiality of being is through the Perfect Man, because one aspect of the Perfect Man is the Absolute *ḥaqq* which is His interior and His Absolute Quiddity, and the other aspect of the Perfect Man is through the universes, and that aspect is his 'I'-ness and manifestedness. Consequently, as the verbal 'I' is not proper to the manifestation of the *ḥaqq*, the 'I'-ness is in the manifestation of the *ḥaqq's* 'I'-ness in the existence, and this manifestation is detailed and with Names, whereas the manifestation of this 'I'-ness in the Perfect Man is total and essential. It could equally be that His 'I'-ness is not particularized in my 'I'-ness in such a way that my 'I'-ness should be different to His 'I'-ness. According to this consideration it means that it remains as was, without there being enveloping or penetration of the one to the other.

However, in me is His place of manifestation, and we are to Him as if a vessel.

This means that in my being there exists the place of manifestation of the *ḥaqq* wherein the *ḥaqq* is manifested and revealed in total manifestation, and that place is the heart of Man. Thus, we are for the *ḥaqq* like a vessel, thus manifesting by us becoming particularized; it can also be understood that He is particularized by the container,

which is the heart, and manifested either with the colour of the vessel, or, if the vessel had no colour, without a colour. However, in the place of manifestation which is the Perfect Man, the manifestation of the *ḥaqq* is in accordance with oneness, whereas the particularization of water in a vessel is according to twoness. Finally, like the particularization of water in the vessel, as the *ḥaqq* is particularized in the place of manifestation which is the human being he said: '. . . as if a vessel.' That is to say, he compared the placeness of manifestation of the human being to the envelopment of the receptacle and he did not compare the manifestation of the *ḥaqq* in the place of manifestation which is the human being to the manifestation of water in the receptacle, because that is according to oneness and this is according to plurality.

And indeed God tells the truth and He conducts in the Way. When the Shaykh (R.A.) descended his own self to the level of 'the place of manifestation of water' in the *ḥaqq* and established the revelation and the particularization and the manifestation of God with all His Names and Qualities of Lordship and God's Divine image of totality in that place of manifestation, he attributed to God the guidance and conduct which emanate from the Divine words, which reaches into the mystery of His speech which becomes manifest from the place of manifestation which is himself, and he said: my speech is the speech of the *ḥaqq*, and He who speaks with that speech is the *ḥaqq*, and His words are the truth, and He who guides and conducts you to the path (fountain) of Union through my speech is the *ḥaqq*, and it is God who guides whom He wants on the straight path.

**The Wisdom of the Truth
(*al-hikmat al-ḥaqqiyya*)
in the Word of Isaac**

**Redeeming a prophet from being sacrificed by
slaughtering a sacrificial offering,
And where are the voices and actions of rams as
compared to the movements and pain of Man?**

Here several interpretations are possible. In the word 'redeeming' there might be a non-written question which would be eliminated due to the question in the second line, this being found satisfactory to convey the meaning of the question, in which case it would mean a surprise that how can the voice and the movement of a ram possibly approximate the movement and pain in Man, and that a ram would be sufficient sacrifice for a prophet? Another way would be without a question: the sacrificing of a ram for an offering redeems the prophet, meaning that it redeemed the prophet. This second would be because of the Quranic verse: 'And We redeemed him with a great sacrifice.' In this case the first verse would be giving news of the fact as it happened, wherein the word 'redeeming' becomes established for the word of God, therefore there being no necessity for a question of surprise, and the question form in the second verse becomes a question which appertains to the determination (*ḥukm*) of the fact (happening) of redeeming, which means that the voices and movements of rams are far removed from the movements of people, and what an extraordinary wisdom is this, when there is a great distance between the degree of the animal and that of the man that a ram could redeem a prophet. In this case there is no doubt in the happening and the validity of the redemption because it has happened, but the question refers to the cause and the reason why such a thing happened. Another aspect is this, which might come to mean that my *nafs* be

redemption for that prophet as a sacrifice as an offering, whose being a sacrifice was sacrificed to the sacrificing of a ram. What is meant by the prophet here is the son of Abraham. Yet another aspect could be that what is meant by the word 'prophet' is Abraham, which would mean: let my *nafs* be an offering to the sacrificer of the sacrifice, who is a prophet. Yet another aspect could be: let my own self be a redemption for the prophet and let it be the offering for the sacrifice of the sacrificial. In this case the first sacrifice would refer to the *nafs* of the Shaykh himself, and from the second mention of sacrifice the intention would be the son of Abraham because it was for him that Abraham was ordered to sacrifice. Yet another aspect of the meaning might be that the first word of sacrifice refers to the ram which appeared to Abraham in the image of his son and that Abraham thought that the ram which appeared as his son was his son, and wanted to sacrifice his son. Under this circumstance it would mean: let my *nafs* be redemption for that prophet for whom the sacrifice for the offering was sacrificed. That is to say, in replacement of the ram his father prepared him for sacrifice. However, as this first line comes to mean that God redeemed His prophet from sacrifice as offering, the Shaykh then refers the phrase of the action to God and says:

And He, the Great God, aggrandized it by graciousness
to all of us,
Or to it, I know not due to what balance.

Now, as God redeemed Abraham or his son, or both of them, by a ram, He aggrandized it by revelation made to it from the Presence of His Name, the Aggrandized, because of His graciousness to us or to it. That is to say, by virtue of the fact that the sacrifice was not made over Isaac, who is according to the Divine Image, but was passed over the ram, He aggrandized the ram and honoured it because of His graciousness to us, that is to say, due to the perpetuation of the total Image which is in the Divine place of manifestation in the universe of the senses, and saved each one of the Mohammedian heirs who are according to the Hanifian (the appellative of Abraham who is called the *hanīf*, steadfast in faith, orthodox) people and the people of Abraham from the affliction of sacrificing sons by the sacrifice of the *nafs*.

This is because the Divine Image is the grandest and cannot be killed or that there should be sacrifice made of it. This grace and aggrandizement can also be taken for the ram who redeems by its being made the sacrifice in the place of, in lieu of, the Perfect Man, who is according to the Divine Image. But I have no knowledge from what balance this is taken, says the Shaykh. However, this means that both of these aspects are true.

Now let it be known like this, that the fact that God aggrandized the ram and qualified it with the Name 'Grand' is due to this wisdom by which Abraham saw this ram in the image of Isaac who is his son who is according to the Divine Image which is in accordance with the grand creation and nature in accordance with the Quranic verse: 'And you are according to a grand nature or creation', yet which Abraham saw, in accordance with his power of imaging, as Isaac in his dream. Thus, having rendered grandeur to it in the dream of Abraham by figuring it in the image of a Perfect Man which is in accordance with the Divine Image which is in accordance with the grand nature or creation, He then rendered it grandeur again in the universe of the senses, this time in the image of a ram replacing his son who was a Perfect Man which Abraham had thought was the intended sacrifice. In this way the ram before redemption being in accordance with the grand image He sacrificed it for the Perfect Man and made it a sacrifice for him, thus aggrandizing it in the totality of aspects, and if before redemption the ram had not been grand it could not have been the redeemer. That is why in the Quran it says: 'And We have redeemed it with a grand sacrifice' whereby it declares and announces that the ram was grand.

The Shaykh's words: 'And He, the Great God, aggrandized . . .' are not the interpretation of the Quranic words: 'And We redeemed it by a grand sacrifice' so that the qualification with the word 'grand' be necessitated by the fact that it was going to replace the son of Abraham at the time of Abraham. The aggrandizement which happened to be for the ram is due to His graciousness to both the ram and us equally, and this is the wisdom of His graciousness in this matter to us because both these aspects are true, and rather perhaps each one of these two aspects necessitates the other, because through graciousness

to us by sacrificing the ram there occurs aggrandizement for it (the ram). This is because as there happens to be no sacrifice for the Perfect Man but he has been redeemed by the ram, the ram becomes nourishment for the Perfect Man, and becoming fluent in all his parts it becomes him (*huwa huwa*). Thus, the grace bestowed upon the Perfect Man becomes the grace bestowed on it and becomes the same. And it is thus that the graciousness to us by the sacrifice of the ram is due to the graciousness to it. Because it follows that the ram imaged in the dream of Abraham in the form of a Perfect Man is in the universe of the senses the nourishment for the Perfect Man, and when it becomes nourishment for him it becomes realized in his image. Thus the ram receives the same grace as with which it becomes the same, and the ram is transported from the degree of animality to the degree of Perfect Man and the graciousness to it becomes the same as the graciousness to us. As the ram veils us from killing (a person), in the same way (the ram veils us), by nourishing us through indwelling, from what we would have been like at the level of our not being nourished, as our image would suffer and change from disintegration (through lack of nourishment). The Shaykh in chapter 72 of the *Futūḥāt* mentions a *ḥadīth* of the Prophet recounted by Jabir concerning all this, and mentions that these are things of great refined and delicate matters and that many people have gone into thinking other ways of re-incarnation because of the departure of souls at the time of dying etc. And after, the Shaykh (R.A.) equally says in this chapter concerning the sacrifice how the spirit imprisoned in the natural image of an animal is released, and goes on to further explanation concerning the sacrifice.

The fact that the Shaykh in this poem says: 'I know not due to what balance' is due to the perfection of his knowledge or because he meant to refer to God saying: '. . . until We know' as if He did not know, or because of a quote from Pharaoh whereby he did not want to attribute knowledge to his own *nafs*. Because of showing respect to a rule of the task (*waḥīfa*) of *tawḥīd* it is also possible that this be due to a consideration that being is manifest in the image of Man as well as in the image of the ram. Whatever way it is, it is the same thing, the reason being abolished either due to the necessities of the poem

or over-abundance of usage, and there is no ambiguity in this and certainly no feigned shortcoming.

Without a doubt the fattened camels and oxen are of
greater value,
But indeed He brought down for the sacrifice the ram
as offering.

The fattened oxen and camels used to be driven to Mecca for sacrifice and these were much more expensive than rams, but in fact it was the ram which was brought down for sacrifice as an offering, which means that as an offering the ram became more of value and deemed more laudable. On the other hand, for aggrandizing the 'face of God' and for the requiring of the passing into a contemplative abstraction and from the point of view of having the love of God dominate over the love of possession and also for the purpose of respecting the best that is for the poor, because no matter how high the price of the sacrifice is, that much is increased the degree of the one who sacrifices, there is no doubt that the value of the oxen and camels is higher than the value of a ram. That is why it is allowed that seven people together could sacrifice one ox or camel. Abdullah ibn Abdal Mutallib (father of the Envoy) sacrificed one such animal for seven people. Thus, according to these considerations it would have been necessary that an ox or a camel should have been sacrificed, but for closeness to God they are less of value than the sacrifice of a ram and they are below the degree of the ram. This is because there is a strength of relationship between the ram and the *nafs* which has surrendered itself, because just as the *nafs* of the ram is surrendered to being sacrificed and where it is surrendered to be *fānī* where it concerns a man, in the same way the surrendered *nafs* concords itself to become *fānī* in God and is ready to expend and give up and exert its spirit for the face of God. Also, the ram (sheep) is created for the purpose of sacrifice, and its milking or reproduction are subject to its being killed, whereas oxen and camels are for riding and carrying heavy loads and that is their main purpose of creation and they are not as commonly used for sacrifice. Thus, although the price of the ox and camel is greater for an offering, the sacrifice of a ram

is higher with regard to the established relationship and original creation.

Oh would that I could have consciousness of how by
its own self was made a substitute
The ram to personify the Caliph of the Most Compassionate (*rahmān*).

In this the Shaykh (R.A.) points to the mystery of Union (*tawhīd*). In fact, in the Wisdom of Enoch this was explained: 'The son is the same as (essence of) his father' etc. That is to say, by pretending to wonder at the replacing of the Caliph of the Most Compassionate by a ram he covets the mystery of *tawhīd*. What he means is that the Being of the *ḥaqq*, although manifested in the image of Isaac, is also manifested in the image of the ram. Thus, the *ḥaqq* did not appoint anything else from His own Self in the image of the Caliph of the Most Compassionate except his own *nafs* which appeared in the form of the ram. Consequently, there results an equality in the sacrifice. This aspect is when it is considered that the ram is sacrificed for the Regent of the Most Compassionate by virtue of the belief of Abraham. Or, the image of the ram which manifested in the image of the Caliph of the Most Compassionate (*rahmān*) in the *khayāl* of Abraham was substituted in the universe of the senses by the image of the ram and was replaced by it, thereby pointing at the fact that his own *nafs* was sacrificed for his own *nafs*. In fact, in reality the order is definitely like this.

Do you not know that indeed the order in this (matter)
is already set in order (regularly arranged)
To be loyal and faithful to the gain and to diminish the
loss?

Do you not know that in fact the order of sacrifice in execution is already set in order? It assures loyalty and faithfulness to gain, and diminishes loss. Which means that when Abraham (S.A.) and his son Isaac spent their *nafs* and their possessions in acts of piety and in accordance with the ordinances of God, God the High made as a sacrifice the ram, whose price was little, to decrease their loss, and

did not do so with the ox and the camel who are of higher price, and by allowing to remain the sacrificial which was the Caliph of God if in fact Isaac had been sacrificed, He completed the gain which resulted for the universes. Consequently, the gain that was to come through that sacrifice came through the sacrificing of the ram and thereby a great deal of diminution in loss. Again, the loss in possessions which would result from the sacrificing of an ox or a camel was reduced by the sacrifice of a much cheaper ram and that also is a gain. Equally, as gain resulted for Isaac in the sacrificing of a ram, a great gain equally resulted for the perfect ones who are the universes. Thus equally for them there is decrease in loss.

Sacrifice is the image of *fanā'* in God, and the greatest sacrifice in the way of God is the sacrifice of the *nafs*. Thus the sacrifice which is the image of the submission and concordance of the *nafs* of Abraham (S.A.) and Isaac (S.A.) is for the purpose of completing and retaining forever the degrees of gains, like belief, beautification and gift, saint-hood, prophethood, envoyship, caliphate, leadership, pure love of God, invitation, and to diminish the characters which cause loss and distancing from the Divine Beauty. In the same way, the sacrifice of the *nafs* which is the image of absolute *fanā'* is keeping loyalty and faithfulness for the pact of *tawhīd* through which the gains of essence and quality and action are gained. In a *ḥadīth qudsī* God says: 'He who demands Me, let him be passionately in love with Me, and he who is passionately in love with Me, let him know Me, and he who knows Me, let him be in love with Me, and he who loves Me, I shall kill him, and he who kills, the blood-money is to him, and upon whom is the blood-money? To Me is his blood-money.' Can there be greater gain than this, that by its essence and quality and action your being is made to pass, and that in your absoluteness, with the Divine image of the collectivity of the Ipseity, the *ḥaqq* manifests and there remains?

Thus the order of sacrifice is already set in order and with it the dues of the pact of Union are made, and not to execute by this the dues of Union is diminution because of loss and loss of aptitude, because for a servant who causes duality by the remaining of his 'I'-ness, the witnessing of unity is not possible. Therefore it is absolutely

impossible without the passing away of the ego, because if all the qualities which are set up over the essence of a man have not passed away, he will not be faithful to that original pact and will not be saved from polytheism. When the Envoy (S.A.) became realized in the total *fanā*' in God he said: 'I loved the killing in the way of God, and killed, and then came to life, then I was killed, and I killed, then I came to life, then I killed and was killed', and God said: 'God buys from the believers their *nafs* and their belongings by what is for them the paradise. They are killed in the way of God and they kill and they kill.' Thus the sacrifice of the *nafs* is the image of passing away into the Absolute, and the sacrifice of the ram is the image of the sacrifice of the *nafs*, and it is the execution of the pact from all eternity. Because of the relationship between the ram and the *nafs* which is submitted with the reality of submission and submitted to passing away, the ram is higher than the ox and the camel and the animal man, and is more suitable because of its strength of abandoning itself to *fanā*' due to its lack of 'I'-ness. The order is set up in Truth, and for the gain it is necessary in full faithfulness to be annihilated in the Ipseity of the *haqq* essentially with action, quality and essence, and it is lack when a person is manifested in the non-existence of annihilation with 'I'-ness due to veiling oneself from the *haqq* and due to the regret which ensues. Because those from among the existents who are not manifested with 'I'-ness and who are in true concordance with God, such as the inanimate objects, are higher than other degrees of existence because of their being existent with Truth and completely in concordance with the Divine order and because they are manifest without 'I'-ness. After them come the plants, and after them come the wild animals and the animals who have strong concordance with the Truth. The ram has more of submission and concordance than the ox and the camel. And Abu Mutallib's sacrifice with a fat animal is due to attention to value and to the honour of the Divine Image.

Order of being is set up, that is to say, until it reaches the degree of the human being by way of concatenation of order from the First Intellect, including thus the totality of degrees of immanence. Some are honourable, some are stingy (narrow-spirited), and the manifestation of order in each is by virtue of the degree. Thus, when the

honourable which is suitable to the honourable is sacrificed, there is gain for faithfulness and passion if it happens in the place of the order, but it becomes diminution if the stinging is sacrificed for the stinging, or when the stinging is sacrificed to the honourable or when the honourable is sacrificed to the stinging. Consequently the diminution due to loss is according to three aspects, and one aspect is this, that when the stinging is sacrificed for the stinging the sacrifice happens due to the loss and sorrow of the sacrifice and of the person for whom the sacrifice was made. Another aspect is this, that if the stinging is sacrificed for the honourable the loss occurs because of the sacrifice. A third aspect is this, that if the honourable is sacrificed to the stinging it is because of the loss and sorrow of the person for whom it is sacrificed. Of all the existents, that which has the strongest submission and concordance to God is the highest and closest to God.

**There is no higher creature than the inanimate object,
and after that**

**The plants, each according to the defined value and
the measure.**

Thus, in concordance and in submission there is no higher creature than the inanimate object. Then come the plants, each according to its definite value and degree. In the Divine knowledge the inanimate objects and metals are higher because they remain and continue according to the knowledge of their essential nature and they never vary from their essential and original character and constitution, and they know where it concerns the way they are used and the value of their manner of usage in accordance with their innate nature. Thus they have surrendered to and concord with the reality of being and degree under the dispensing under the Divine Will, because they are realized with being and degree and essence, which is that there is no other dispenser than the Being of the *ḥaqq*, and dispensing is not real for any one person other than Him. The plants are lower than the inanimate objects in degree because their innate ability of movement is added on to the original nature of the inanimate objects through growth. Even though growth is of the natural necessity of the plants, yet that natural constitution of movement through growth is attributable to

them. Thus, this natural movement is dispensing which is attributed to themselves, and this is added on to their original constitution. It is according to this consideration that the knowledge of the plants is lower than the knowledge of the inanimate objects. Then, as all plants are in the same degree of knowledgeability due to the consideration of their growth, yet in their varieties there is a definite value and fixed measure in honour or in stinginess or in ability to do good or ill.

And those of senses after the plants, and they all know
By their positive qualities (nature) through intuition or
explanation of evidence.

After the plants it is the animals who have senses. In knowledge they are lower than the plants and the inanimate objects, yet they all know the positive qualities (nature), and their knowledge is established through intuition and by explanation of evidence. In other words, the animals who have senses are lower in this above-mentioned knowledge than the inanimate objects and plants because in them the ability to dispense and movement is more, that is to say, there is more ability to dispense etc. Thus, the original knowledge of the essential innate constitution in these things which have the senses is lower than that which is established for the inanimate objects to the degree that they are superior in movement and comprehension (*idrāk*), and to the degree of their superiority in observing what there is of usefulness and ill through their comprehension and action they are that much lower than the plants, and all of these know their creator by virtue of their own degree, and the total knowledge is various by virtue of degrees. In the rest of the line it would mean that the knowledge of all of the inanimate objects and plants and animals by their creaturality and nature is known to us through intuition and explanation of evidence, because at the level of the people of *kashf* and *shuhūd* all existence is alive (*ḥayy*) and each life (*ḥayy*) knows its creator. What is meant by explanation of evidence is what is bestowed of examples from the pure laws and illuminated intelligence. And from all of these categories: 'They praise God, that which is in the heavens and in earth', and also: 'There is not a thing which does not praise and give gratitude, but you do not understand their praise-giving.' This is so. No praise

emanates from the praise-giver except after its being alive (its being in the state of *hayy*) and equally after its knowing that there is a creator and a Lord who is the possessor of all perfection, who gives it its nature (creates it) and educates it. Thus intuition and explanation, and also witnessing of determination which is evidence, shows and necessitates that the *haqq* (God, the Truth) is revealed in everything and that He is fluent in every existent with His Singularity, and that the *haqq* is the same as that life and knowledge which is in that existent. Even perhaps that each Name from among the Divine Names is qualified therein with all the Names due to the prevalence of the Uniqueness of the Ipseity to all Names; at such a degree that all the necessities which exist in the origin of existences exist therein. Where there is a place in which there is being, there also exists knowledge and intellect; however, only if the place does not impede the arrangement (levelling) of the human being; that is to say, if it does not reach the height of the place of equilibrium which necessitates the manifestation of the place of the intellect and comprehension, then life and comprehension remain interior of that place and do not manifest in that place. Consequently, that place has no feeling or consciousness, like a deaf mute. Consequently the inanimate objects and plants are possessors of life and comprehension in their interior but not in manifestation. In each thing which has senses there is the self and there is determination (*hukm*) and conjecture (*wahm*) so that it comprehends its *nafs* by its power of animality and becomes veiled with its 'I'-ness and becomes delineated in determination, but the one that has no senses and self is contrary to this situation because it remains purely in accordance with its innate nature. Therefore it has no dispensation through its own 'I'-ness. Thus the inanimate objects intuitively and in reality know their Lord, and willingly and spontaneously submit to it and concord with it. After these come the plants because in them there is a dispensation of a kind, like growing and like propagating, and due to this dispensing and action the plants are less than the inanimate objects because the inanimate objects witness by their essence and innate nature that there is no other dispenser than God. After these comes the sensitive animal which is veiled by its selfness and is manifest by Divine Will. After that comes the lacking human who is

ignorant of his Lord and is polytheistic where He is concerned, and is delineated in his vision and especially in the knowledge of God, and that is because he is veiled with 'I'-ness and is conditioned by his intellect and reason or even by imitative belief.

But the one that is called by the Name Adam is conditioned

By intellect and reason or imitative belief.

The creature which is named by the Name Adam (Man) is less than the other animals and the plants and inanimate objects in this knowledge of the Divine innate natural knowledge which is not changed and varied by the effects of the *nafs* and accidental non-essential dispensation, thus he is lacking because he conditions the order by inferences and by intellectual theoretical deduction or deductive reasoning or by imitative belief. He changes his innate knowledge by his intellect or reason or belief or by his dogma, and blends it with reasons of dispensation and movements of the will of the 'I'-ness. Thus, as the ram or sheep is realized with the innate knowledge and is completely in concordance and submission to sacrifice, the sacrifice happened with it. What one should conclude from these words is this, that the sacrifice did not happen with an animal that is greater in value than the ram, nor did the sacrifice happen with the inanimate objects which are more knowledgeable than the ram, but it happened with the ram, because the ram, although it is lower than the degree of the Perfect Man by the aspect of its being an animal, and is lacking as compared to the man in guidance and knowledge and being the place of manifestation, yet it is higher than the human man because the ram by essence and reality knows its creator, unlike the human animal who thinks he knows it by reason and intellect, because the comprehension of the human animal of that knowledge is a deductive theoretical knowledge and it happens that at certain times this knowledge is not in concordance with the essence of the order, thus it does not express its essence, because it is possible that the reality is other than his theory and deduction in the view of another who has a different theory and deduction through another aspect. However, the guidance and the essential knowledge of the animal is in opposition to that because

in it there is never a difference because the animal is created and innately constituted according to that (to what it is).

Now, let it be known like this, that you should not think that in the words: 'There is no higher creature than the inanimate object' that the inanimate objects are higher in every way than all other things and that they are followed by plants and then those who have senses, then the human animal, because in the order of incatenation which starts with the aspect of the human image which is the total Divine Image, the inanimate objects are lower than the plants because the inanimate objects are according to inanimation, therefore have no movement, and plants are higher than them because there is more of life (*hayy*) manifested in them and they are thereby closer in one degree to the human image than the inanimate objects. Animals in the same way are higher than the plants because they also cut a degree higher than the plants and are closer to the human image than the plants as the life of the senses is more manifest in them, and the human animal equally is higher than all the rest because in consequence of its manifestation he is according to the most beautiful arrangement and includes the qualities of the animal, of the plant and of the inanimate objects, and in him the life of the senses, the comprehensions of will and the Divine Qualities are more plurally manifest than in all the others, and between the human animal and the Perfect Man, who is according to the Divine Image, there is no degree other than the spiritual degrees, but the reason why the human animal is lower than all the others is due to the fact that the qualifications of all degrees from the three degrees are collected in him and because he is assiduously applying to himself all of them, and because the states and qualities which exist effectively in all the degrees of immanence exist equally effectively in the human animal and because he is by all this distanced from the original unity and the determinations of plurality are plurally manifested in him, and his being a central object and an intermediary and his ability to act by his own means being more than all the others, because of all this 'they are like the sheep and goats, perhaps even more misled' and 'their density is more than that of stones', and words like these, became his qualificative. Yet, if the qualities of beauty of the three degrees, perhaps even the qualities of

completion and perfection by which the three degrees are one higher than the other in their arrangement, if all these were present in the man, the man then would be higher than the animal and would have attained the degree of completion and perfection. For example, the concordance and submission which is present through the essential innate nature in the inanimate objects and also for example their lack of movement and will and lack of dispensing by virtue of their annihilation under God's dispensation, and in the case of the plants like their not being able to move by their own selves, and their growth being due to the nourishment they receive and their movement being due to the winds and not through their own selves, and equally the animals who have accepted, each variety, what has been proposed to them as service from the original creation, and are established and continuous upon that and have no orders of stinginess and opposition to the states of the senses of the immanence other than what is necessary for them to continue their existence by way of eating and drinking, and who give thanks and gratitude and grace to their Lord, whereas the human animal is not established in 'like when they were created', and of the qualities above-mentioned, one quality does not exist in them. That is why they are lower than the others. Thus, if it were that there existed in Man the qualities of completeness, which are mentioned in the animal, the plant and the inanimate objects, which are the three degrees, and if Man were qualified by these, he would have attained the degree of completion. It is perhaps also that the innate essence of the inanimate objects is according to the essential nature of the essential unity, by which they are higher than all others. For Man to attain to that degree is the man's attainment of the degree of completion and perfection. The predication of the Perfect Man is not like the predication of the animal man. The Perfect Man, the *insān-i-kāmil*, the Complete Man, is the most honourable and the most total of all existents, and by the fact that he is *fānī* in the Being of the *ḥaqq* by essence and qualities, the totality of the Divine perfections is manifest in him, and he is by the extent of his receptivity present in the totality of the places of manifestability of qualities and essence. The animal man has changed his original innate nature through his intellect and reason, and has immured the Absolute Being

within the reckoning (*ḥisāb*) and estimation within the obligations of the comprehension of his reasoning and intellect. 'They are of those who regret the most through their works, those for whom their efforts have misled in the life of this world, and they reckon that they, by their doing, that they make things more beautiful.'

It is as Sahl said, and the verifiers like us,
For us and for them, (we are) at the station of
beautification (*iḥsān*).

Sahl ibn Abdullah Tostari and other verifiers like us, agree on this matter, that it is as we have said concerning the animals, plants and the inanimate objects, and that the inanimate objects are the most submissive and obedient, because we and others like us who verify, we are together at the station of beautification and witnessing where we witness the totality of the order as it is. The degree of *iḥsān* is the degree above that of belief. God the High said: 'Then they were devout and they believed, and then they were devout and they beautified.' (*Aḥsan* from the root *ḥusn* and Divine Name *muḥsin*, Beautifier, and *iḥsān*, the gift of Beauty.) The Prophet (S.A.) says: 'The *iḥsān* is that you worship God as if you saw Him.' The degree of *iḥsān* is the degree of seeing everything and witnessing everything as it is. The Shaykh (R.A.) says in chapter 72 of the *Futūḥār*: 'It is shown to you that the inanimate objects, they are knowers of God and they pray to God otherwise than other creatures. They are created in knowledge, not by intellect of their own, nor by desires, nor by ability to dispense except dispensing what has been dispensed for them, not through their own *nafs*. They dispense only by what God dispenses for them. The plants are created with knowledge in the same way and their degree is less, lower, because of growing and demand of height. They appertain to the class that are nourished, and this gives them growth and the demand for height, and the inanimate objects are not like this. They have no height through natural movement, and if they happen to be high they decrease through their nature and require lowness and this is the truth of servanthood. Height is the praise of God and He is the High, but the stone is devoid of the vicissitudes of Lordship. When in height they diminish from fear of God, and God gives us

news of this: "And there are of them who diminish from the fear of God." "There are knowing servants who fear God." "He who is afraid indeed knows from what he is afraid", and this is the belief of Sahl ibn Abdullah Tostari. There is no higher than Man of the quality of the inanimate objects, and after that the plants, and after that the animals, and this is the one that dispenses most . . . and the stones are most veridic servants who never go out of their origin and their emergence.'

He who has witnessed the order, like that which I have
witnessed,
He says as I say, whether in secret or openly.

Thus, if a person has witnessed the order as it is, like I have witnessed, in secret or openly he will speak my words, meaning that if somebody witnesses the individuated *ḥaqq* in the potentialities or essences of beings, he has gnosis that all the essences of the beings lead to the *ḥaqq* by an essential leading, and that their knowledge of their being is original and innate and natural, consequently he will speak the same words whether in secret or in public.

Pay no regard to words which contradict what we say,
Do not seed your fruit in barren earth.

'Barren earth' is this kind of an earth where there is no permission for growth. This means, do not pay any attention or give value or consideration to the words of the people who have theories and reasons and who observe the veiledness of things rather than observing the existing and witnessed God, because their words are according to senses and supposition and are not according to witnessing (*shuhūd*). And do not sow the kernel in barren land, meaning, do not sow the kernel of the gnosis of the Lord and the Divine realities into the narrow hearts of the people of the exterior who are people of theory and deduction, and also the people who imitate them; just as because of the lack of aptitude in that barren earth that kernel will not fructify, those who have warped their natural inclination and aptitude by intellectual proofs and reasonable deductions, their hearts will not fructify the results of gnosis of realities from the seed of gnosis, and

they do not accept the word of God which is the nourishment of the spirit. The Shaykh declares then the lack of aptitude to accept the word of God:

They are the deaf and dumb, and of them he gave,
The pure one, so that we hear of it as evident proof in
the Quran.

That is to say, they are deaf and dumb, that group of people whom the pure one (S.A.) brought to us (told us of) without a doubt in the Quran so that we hear about them. 'They are deaf and dumb and blind and they will not understand.' That is, deaf because of the partiality of their intellectual comprehension and their ears are blocked, and they are dumb from speaking with the word of God, their tongues being sealed through the intellectual proofs and theoretical reasoning, and in every witnessing of God their eyes and their hearts are blinded. Behind the interior veil of intellectual comprehension they cannot observe the reality of the bride of Beauty and the face of God in the places of manifestation which are the things. 'They are not blinded in the eye, but they are blinded in their hearts which are in their chests.' The people who are veiled from God, though they are people of heart and eyes and ears, God has taken away from them their hearing, their vision and speech with intelligent expression. 'They have hearts which do not understand. They have eyes that do not see. They have ears with which they do not hear. They are like the cattle or sheep herds, perhaps even they are more misled.'

Know, God has accorded help to us and to you, that Abraham (S.A.), the *khalīl*, said to his son: 'I saw in a dream that I was sacrificing you', and the dream is the Presence of *khayāl* but he did not interpret it, and it was that the ram had appeared in the image of the son of Abraham in the dream. Oh you follower (*sālik*) who sacrifices for God the ram of his *nafs*, and Oh you who are annihilated in the Being of the *ḥaqq* by the *fanā'* in God, know that God the High has accorded help to us and to you with bestowal of success in salvation in that in fact Abraham, the *khalīl* (S.A.), said to his son: 'I saw that I was sacrificing you in the dream', whereas the dream is the Presence of *khayāl* and needs to be interpreted, but Abraham (S.A.) did not

interpret the dream. He took it as it appeared, but that which was seen in the dream was the ram which he saw in the image of the son of Abraham.

Now, let it be known like this, that in the words of God the High: 'And We have redeemed it with a grand sacrifice', the fact that He sacrificed the grand immolation for the son of Abraham is because in the mind of Abraham (S.A.) it was his son, but what he really saw was the ram, which, because of the relationship of concordance and submission, was apparent in the dream in the image of the son. Thus, the appearance of the ram in the dream of the Caliph of the Most Compassionate (*rahmān*) (which was Abraham), and because of its relationship of being sacrificed for it, as has already been mentioned before this, the words: 'And We redeemed it with a grand sacrifice' descended because of what there was in the mind of Abraham, because of all this the Shaykh (R.A.) in these stanzas questions by way of delving deep into the matter that it was the ram that Abraham saw in his imagination in the image of his son, and thereby he points at the fact that its sensory image of being a ram was sacrificed in his dream to the image of his imagination which was seen in the appearance of a man in his dream.

Now, dream is the Presence of relative *mithāl* which is called *khayāl*. That which appears in this is sometimes the same as what happens in the exterior and sometimes it does not accord with the exterior. Rather perhaps it (the *nafs*) comprehends a meaning from among the unknowable meanings through a certain channel where there is no interconnection between the *nafs* and the *ḥaqq*, or it can also happen that it takes it from among the meanings which are inscribed in the higher spirits. That is why in the images of the *mithāl* it becomes represented to the *nafs* by whatever image is appropriate for it among the images of the Presence of *khayāl*. Thus it is necessary to interpret that image seen, so that what is meant by it is known. Abraham (S.A.) did not interpret the dream because he was accustomed to taking from the universe of representations (*mithāl*), and when the High God elevated the heart of Abraham from the universe of representations to extend over it His *rahmān*, and left him without it, his *khayāl* took the meaning from his abstracted heart, and his power of

imaging dispensing from the meaning of the image had imaged the ram in the form of Isaac due to the establishment of the established relationship in submission and concordance between Isaac and the ram. Thus the dream of Abraham necessitated interpretation but he did not interpret it. Abraham believed the dream. That is, taking it according to the appearance of the dream he supposed the image seen was Isaac, whereas at the level of God that image seen was the grand sacrifice. Thus Abraham (S.A.) did not bestow upon the *khayāl* its reality by interpreting it. And his Lord redeemed him from the *wahm* of Abraham with the grand sacrifice which was the interpretation of his dream at the level of God, but he (Abraham) did not have consciousness of this. Thus, due to the *wahm* of Abraham, his Lord (Isaac's Lord) sacrificed the grand sacrifice for the son of Abraham, and at the level of God the grand sacrifice was the interpretation of Abraham's dream. However, he had no aptitude for it; which means that due to the dispensing of the *khayāl* of Abraham, although the interpretation for the son of Abraham was the grand sacrifice at the level of God and that it was due to this fact that it had appeared in the image of the son which would then necessitate the interpretation of that image seen as the grand sacrifice, the image was not interpreted by it (i.e. the grand sacrifice) because Abraham had no consciousness of this interpretation. In the Arabic of Ibn 'Arabi: 'And his Lord redeemed him', these words refer to the son of Abraham, and the words: '. . . the interpretation of his dream' refer to Abraham. The revelation in images in the Presence of *khayāl* needs another knowledge by which is comprehended what God intends by such an image. Thus, the image revelations which happen in the Presence of the *khayāl* need another kind of knowledge, and what God intends from that which is seen is understood with the help of that knowledge. This knowledge is the knowledge of interpretation, and the knowledge of interpretation does not happen except by the intuition and growing of the refinements of the Divine Names, and by the increasing and the intuition of the relationships which exist between those Names which appertain to the interior and those Names which are under the plane of the apparent. Thus the person who has gnosis of the relationship which exists between the images and their meaning, and the

degrees of *nafs* due to which the *khayāl* images manifest in the Presence of the *khayāl*, knows thoroughly the knowledge of interpretation. Do you not see how the Envoy (S.A.) said to Abu Bakr (R.A.) of this in the interpretation of dreams: 'You were right in some, and in some you were faulty', and Abu Bakr asked to know in which he had been right and where he had been wrong, but he, benediction and peace be upon him, did not accede. These words prove that the revelation of images needs another knowledge. Do you not see that the Envoy told Abu Bakr, you were right in some and wrong in some, and when Abu Bakr asked him where he had been right and where he had been wrong, the Envoy (S.A.) did not describe. This is retold by the author of *Sharḥ al-Sunna*, Ibn Abbas (R.A.), who said that Abu Hurayra (one of the close disciples of Mohammed – he was called 'Father of Cats' because one day they were sitting and the call to prayer came. He saw that a cat was asleep on his coat so he cut round the cat in order not to disturb it) recounted: 'One day a man came to the Envoy and said: "I saw in my dream a cloud from which was coming down butter and honey, and I saw people who gathered it up with their hands. Some received a lot, some a little. And I saw a rope arriving from the sky to the earth, and I saw you, Oh Envoy of God, hold onto it and you were elevated. After you another man took hold of it and he was elevated. After him another man, and he was elevated. After that another man took it but he was prevented. Then he reached it again and was raised." Abu Bakr (R.A.) said: "By my father, you and my mother and by God, if thou dost permit me I will interpret it", and (the Envoy) said: "Interpret it." He (Abu Bakr) said: "The cloud is the cloud of Islam, and that which rains as butter and honey is the gentleness and sweetness of the Quran, but the ones that gather a lot and those who gather a little are the ones that gather a lot from the Quran and those who gather a little from it. And the rope which reaches to the earth from the sky, that is the Truth which you hold onto, and God elevates you. After you, another man holds onto it and he is elevated, and after that another man holds onto it and is elevated, and after that another man holds onto it and is prevented, and afterwards he reaches it again and he is elevated. Oh Envoy of God, will you tell me if I was right or if I made a mistake?" Peace be

upon him, said: "In some places you were right and in some places you were wrong." (Abu Bakr) said: "I swear by my father, you and my mother, Oh Envoy of God, will you tell me in what I made a mistake?" Upon him peace, said: "Do not swear, this is the *ḥadīth* upon the veracity of which people concord."

And God the High called to Abraham (S.A.) with the words: 'Indeed Oh Abraham, you have believed the dream', which means that in fact, Oh Abraham, you have believed the dream and you took it as it was and you made it a true dream. But He did not say to him: 'You were right in the dream in that it was your son', because he (Abraham) did not interpret it and took it as he saw it in the exterior, yet the dream demands interpretation. This means that God the High did not say to Abraham: 'You were right in the dream', which means again that He did not say (to Abraham), you were right in the dream and in fact that what you saw was your son, because Abraham did not interpret the dream but rather took it in the manifest form as he saw it, whereas the dream requires interpretation. Thus, having attested to the truth of the dream without interpreting it he was not right in what was in the dream, because had he been right in the dream the vision seen would have been his son, then in the manifest form he would have had to sacrifice his son. However, what Abraham had seen, which was manifested to him in the image of his son, was the ram, but he did not interpret it as the ram whereas that dream needed interpretation. It is thus that the notable Lord said: 'In fact you must interpret the dream', and the meaning of interpretation is the permission from the image seen to another order. It is because the dream requires interpretation that the notable Lord of Egypt said: 'In fact you must interpret the dream', and the meaning of interpretation is that the seer is permitted to pass to another order from the image he has seen in his dream, which other order is what is intended from the image. And the cows were years in drought and in plenty. Thus, in the words of the Lord of Egypt, when he said: 'I saw seven fat cows eating seven emaciated ones', following Joseph's interpretation, or in its reality, the years became years of dearth or abundance, which means, by the images of the fat cows was intended the years of plenty and abundance, and by the images of the emaciated cows was

meant years of dearth and drought. Thus the ruler of Egypt who was this notable Lord who was, according to some, named in Arabic as Rayyan, the son of Walid, knowing that the dream necessitated interpretation, required the interpretation of fat and emaciated cows, and Joseph (S.A.) interpreted the fat cows and the green heads of wheat as years of plenty, and the emaciated cows and dry heads of wheat as years of dearth. If he had believed in the dream faithfully he would have sacrificed his son, but he believed only in the dream wherein that was the same as his son. This means that if Abraham (S.A.) had taken the dream completely veridically, that is to say, if what was seen in the dream in the image of Abraham's son were not the ram and it were his son, certainly he would have sacrificed him. But he testified to the dream that what he saw was the same as his son, that is to say, he saw that he was sacrificing his son, but he was faithful to the dream in the manifest and started the sacrificing of the son. But at the level of God it was not anything other than the grand sacrifice in the image of his son. However, that which was seen was not at the level of God except that it was the grand sacrifice, manifested in the dream in the image of his son. That is to say, what Abraham saw himself sacrificing in his dream was not his son but it was the grand sacrifice which was manifest in the image of his son. And He redeemed it when (because) it happened in the mind of Abraham (S.A.), and it was not redemption in the essence of the order at the level of God. Thus God redeemed the son of Abraham with the grand sacrifice because the child had occurred to the mind of Abraham and because of this the grand sacrifice is not a redemption in the essence of the order at the level of God, because God had not ordered Abraham to sacrifice his son so that He need redeem him with another sacrifice. Rather that because it occurred to the mind of Abraham in the image of his son that in the manifest God redeemed it, and what had appeared in the imagination of Abraham in the image of his son was nothing other than the grand immolation upon which in the image of the senses the actual sacrifice happened. Thus in the essence of the order there was no redemption so redemption applies to the son of Abraham. And the words: 'And He redeemed it' refer to the son of Abraham, meaning that God sacrificed the grand immolation for the son of

Abraham, and the words: ' . . . in the essence of the order at the level of God' are an attribution of explanation. The senses imaged the sacrifice, and the *khayāl* imaged the son of Abraham. Thus, the manifest senses imaged the sacrifice because that which was going to be sacrificed was sacrificed at the level of God. Thus, at the level of God every thing, whichever image it is established as, is manifested with that image in the universe of the senses, and the universe of senses is more total and larger than the universe of *khayāl*. Because of the relationship of submission and concordance between the son of Abraham and sacrifice the *khayāl* imaged the son of Abraham, because the *khayāl* images one meaning in different forms. That is why the dream needs interpretation. If he had seen the ram in the *khayāl* he might have interpreted it by his son, or by another order. That is, if Abraham (S.A.) had seen in his dream that he was sacrificing the ram he might certainly have interpreted it by his son or another order which would be related and appropriate to the ram, because the desert of the realm of the dream is interpretation. Then He said: 'This is indeed an evident trial' (a manifest seeking of information, way of becoming informed). This to say either that Abraham said after he had witnessed the reality of the situation, or God the High, after having tested Abraham for information, said, that indeed this here order is a blatant trial, that is to say, a manifest seeking of information, that is to say, seeking of information in knowledge, that is to say, whether he knows what is necessitated by the province of a dream where it concerns interpretation, or not. That is to say, by these words God meant to seek information in knowledge on whether Abraham (S.A.) knew or not what the province of dreams necessitated of interpretation, because He knows that the realm of dreams requires interpretation. Because God the High knows that in fact the province of dreams requires interpretation. Thus He tested Abraham in knowledge, but Abraham did not accomplish what was necessitated as interpretation in the realm of dreams.

Now, that dream in which the image seen does not concord with the image in the exterior needs interpretation. But that dream in which what the Presence of *khayāl* images is concordant with the image in the exterior does not accept interpretation. Thus, when he

says: '... the realm of dreams requires interpretation' he refers to the first category which is that which most often happens. People, in the dreams which require interpretation, are according to two categories. One of these knows the realm of dreams, and the other part is those who are pupils who study and learn. Thus, the one who knows is faithful in the dream, and the one who is learning attests to the dream. That is to say, he attests to the images which are seen in the dream and takes it as concordant to what happens in the essence of the order and awaits that God teaches him so that he would know from the image that is revealed to him what is meant by it. Abraham was of the second category. He (Abraham) did not take heed of what was the portion in this realm and because of that believed in the dream. Thus Abraham (S.A.) was not mindful, did not know of what was required of interpretation in the realm of dreams, and did not allocate the portion necessary to the realm of dreams, and Abraham attested to the dream because of unawareness of this.

Let it be known like this, that the seeking of information and trials which concern the prophets and the saints are the causes of the manifestation of the perfection, completion and knowledge, which are to be immanenced in the established potentialities. Thus, when the Will of God the High appertained to raising Abraham to the knowledge of interpretation by manifesting to him in the images of *mithāl* of the senses the meanings of the Unknowable, He tested him for information by showing to him in the Presence of dreams the ram in the image of Isaac. After this, contrary to his usage (habit, custom), he interpreted the image of Isaac with that of the ram. What became manifest in this is the completion and perfection of Abraham's and Isaac's submission to and belief in God, but Abraham did not know what was required of interpretation in the realm of dreams because the knowledge of interpretation was not manifest to him in his established potentiality. Just as did not know Taqi ibn Mukhallad, Imam, master of attestations, who heard in the news that was established (verified, attested) near him, that the S.A. said: 'When someone sees me in a dream he has really seen me when awake because in fact the Satan cannot represent my image.' And Taqi ibn Mukhallad saw the Prophet in a dream and the Prophet (S.A.) gave him milk to drink in

this dream, and in this dream Taqi ibn Mukhallad believed in the milk and made himself vomit and he vomited milk. If he had interpreted his dream this milk would have been knowledge. God forbade him great knowledge equal to the value of what he drank. Just as Taqi ibn Mukhallad who is an Imam, master of attestations, was unaware. Taqi heard in the news established near Taqi that in fact the Prophet (S.A.) said: 'If a person sees me in a dream, in fact he sees me as when awake, because the Satan cannot be represented according to my image.' Taqi ibn Mukhallad saw the Prophet, peace be upon him, in his dream, and the Prophet (S.A.) made him drink milk in this dream. Thus Taqi ibn Mukhallad believed in his dream upon awakening. That is to say, he thought it was milk, but it was not milk. It was knowledge. Thus he made himself vomit. Consequently, he vomited milk. If he had interpreted his dream that milk would have been great knowledge for him. Thus God forbade him great knowledge only to the limit of what he drank of milk. As Taqi ibn Mukhallad did not know that his dream required interpretation, and not having interpreted the milk as knowledge, he became prevented from great knowledge to the degree of what he drank of that milk and vomited. Do you not see the Envoy, whom God blessed and gave him peace, who was given a cup of milk in his dream and who said: 'I drank of it until it came out of my nails, and then I gave what was left to Omar' (Caliph Omar who was a disciple). They asked him: 'What did you interpret it with Oh Envoy of God?' He said: 'Knowledge', and he did not leave it as milk as in the image that he saw, because of his knowledge of the realm of dreams and what they need of interpretation. Do you not see that in the dream the Envoy of God, upon whom God gave peace and blessings, was given a cup of milk, and the Envoy (S.A.) said thus: 'I drank that milk until it came out of my nails. After that, what was left in the cup of my leftover I gave to Omar.' From among those who were present in this gathering, they asked him: 'Oh Envoy of God, with what thing did you interpret the milk?' The Envoy (S.A.) said: 'I interpreted it with knowledge.' That is to say, the Envoy (S.A.) interpreted the milk with 'knowledge' and did not leave it as milk according to the image he saw. Because of his knowledge of the realm of dreams and what they need of

interpretation the Envoy (S.A.) interpreted the milk with knowledge. Just as milk is nourishment to the bodies of children, who are needy, the beneficial knowledge is nourishment for the spirits who are needy, who are in the state of innate nature, and because of the relationship between knowledge and milk which completes those who are needy, knowledge manifested in the image of milk. It is that the image of the Prophet (S.A.) that the senses have witnessed is buried in Medina, and indeed the image of his spirit and his subtlety not one person has ever witnessed, be it in (the place of manifestation of) a person, or in his own person (place of manifestation). In fact, it became known that the elemental and human image of the Prophet (S.A.) that senses have witnessed, that image is buried in Medina. Nobody's vision reaches that. The images of his subtlety and his spirituality are the image of his light. No one can observe this from the place of manifestation of anyone or from his own place of manifestation by virtue of the fact that he is abstracted from the places of manifestation, that is to say, the spiritual image of the Prophet. All spirits are in this same situation, that is, all the spirits are like this and the image of their light is not seen. It is embodied for him, (that is to say, for the seer), the spirit of the Envoy (S.A.) in the dream, in the image of his body, the body he died in. The dream does not remove anything from that. He is Mohammed, blessed by God and peace upon him, by virtue of his spirit in the image of his body, which resembles the image of the body that is buried. It is not possible for the Satan to image the image of this body. This is purity from God for the benefit of the one who sees. The Shaykh (R.A.) explains in these words the manner in which the vision of the Prophet (S.A.) is visible in a dream. The person who sees this dream sees the spirit of the Prophet (S.A.) imaged and embodied in the form of the body in which the Prophet (S.A.) died. The dream does not remove anything from that body of the senses. That is to say, in whichever image the Envoy (S.A.) departed from that body, the Presence of dreams represents his spirit in the image of that body, without removing anything or subtracting anything. Thus, that which is embodied is Mohammed, God's blessing and peace upon him, by virtue of his spirit, and he is seen in that body which is exactly similar to the one buried in Medina. It is not

possible for the Satan to be embodied in the image of the body of the Envoy (S.A.). This is guarantee of purity from God for the seer of the dream so that the person who sees that dream is not misled by seeing the Satan in the image of the Envoy. These last words of the Shaykh, God be pleased with him, are purely exposed for manifest understanding, meaning that the person who expects from the image of the body of the Envoy (S.A.) manifestation of guidance does not get seduced by simulating by that which is opposition of the place of manifestation of guidance. He is protected from this. Leaving aside the purity and the unsullied state of the person who sees the dream, if it were possible for the Satan to embody the image of the body of the Prophet (S.A.), that person who sees the dream would still remain unsullied because the image of that body would protect him, perhaps that that image would even protect the Satan from misleading, because it is not possible to have any form of misleading from that image because that image is the image of pure compassion; perhaps even if it were possible for the Satan to embody that image he would then become a believer when he embodied it and would manifest by virtue of that state with the Mohammedian quality of the Mercy of the Compassionate.

Now, in reality the wisdom of or the reason for the impossibility of the Satan to embody the image of the body of Mohammed is this, that the Satan is from the parts of the universe a low part. He is the place of manifestation of the Name, the Misleader (*mudill*), and the quality of misleading, and he has no receptivity or ability to be the place of manifestation of another Name from among the Names. Equally, it is not possible for any other quality from among the Divine Qualities to manifest in him, because had he had the power and the receptivity in him to manifest with another quality, he would have prostrated to Adam and would not have been called with the Name Satan (*shayṭān*). On the other hand, the image of the Mohammedian embodiment is the image of Divine collectivity of Names, absoluteness and relativity, non-particularization and particularization, and equally it combines in itself that which is God (*ḥaqq*) and creature (*khalq*) and the totality of the collectivity of the Divine Qualities as well as immanential qualities. Hence, for a low part of that

image of Divine and immanential collectivity which is relativized and conditioned by a partial quality, it is an impossible order for that to be embodied in the image of the body of the collectivity of the Divine totality. Had there been a possibility that it should have been embodied in that image, there would have been a receptivity in it to be a believer. And thus (and according to this), then to follow on from there, let those who see him in this image take all that he orders or forbids or what he gives as news of things, or whichever way, let him take from him, peace be upon him, as if he were in the life of this world, from the determinations according to what they may be, whether it be from him in words of guidance or whether they be evident proof in the manifest, or a succinct summary, or whatever way it may be. This means that according to what has been mentioned, if somebody sees Mohammed, blessings and peace upon him, in his dream, because it is effectively him (Mohammed) that he sees, thus if a person sees him in this image, that is, in the image of his body in appearance in his dream, let him take from the Prophet, peace be upon him, the totality of the things by which he orders him or from which he forbids him or that he gives him as news of things, just as he would have taken the determinations from the Prophet (S.A.) if the Prophet (S.A.) had been in the life of this world, and all that the Prophet would have said concerning a matter according to the measure of that matter, either as words coming from the Envoy, whether these words be evident proof in the manifest or a succinct summary, or in whichever way it occurs; let him take then, just as he would have done from the Envoy during the life in this world, received and accepted the determinations and guidance given by his language according exactly to the way he gave them, without interpretation, because it is not possible to imagine that these words of the Prophet can be other than as what they mean, because during his lifetime the Envoy, if he aimed at giving out a determination, he always spoke of that in the way that led to it, because there is no ignorance in the order. Thus, in the universe of dreams equally, the man who sees the dream takes the determinations from him exactly in the way that the words of the Envoy lead to, because for a person to observe him (the Prophet) in his dream is exactly the same as to see

him in the universe of senses. (If the Envoy) gave something (to the person who has the dream), that very thing is exactly that and interpretation enters into it, and if that thing comes out in the senses exactly like it was in the imagination (*khayāl*), such a dream does not need interpretation. This means that if the Prophet gave somebody something in a dream, that is indeed that very thing, which means that it is that dream into which enters the interpretation. However, if in the imagination that which is seen comes out into the exterior in exactly the same image as has been seen, in other words, if the sensory image is the same as the image of the *khayāl*, for that dream there is no interpretation because it is conformed to the original, and the way it is conformed to the original is this, that when an order of the Essence comes down upon the spirit of the one who sees the dream, the opposite of that order manifests in the spirit by reflection through the *nafs*, and then the opposite of that opposite reflects into the power of imagination of the one who sees the dream. Thus, in the senses that image takes form exactly as its original because it is the opposite of the opposite since the essential order takes it out of the dream into the senses exactly in the image that the person who sees the dream sees it in the dream. It is up to this much, and it is to this that Abraham, the *khalīl*, and Taqi ibn Mukhallad trusted, which means that Abraham, peace be upon him, saw that he was sacrificing his son, and in the senses he took it as his son, and Taqi ibn Mukhallad saw himself drinking the milk, and in the senses he thought it was milk. However, Abraham was pure and innocent and God the High purified him from the sacrifice of his son, but He did not prevent Taqi ibn Mukhallad from throwing up the milk, thus He forbade him that much knowledge as he drank (and threw up). Since the dream has these two aspects (that is, of interpretation or not) and God let us know what is good form (*adab*) (for us in these matters) by what He did with Abraham when He showed him the ram in the image of his son and He redeemed his son by it, and when He said to him the words: 'Indeed, Oh Abraham, you have believed in the dream', that is to say, when, concerning a dream, these two aspects, that is to say, interpretation and no interpretation, have been established, and God the High has taught us the good form in His action towards

Abraham, which is showing him the ram in the image of his son, and His intent for the order of sacrifice, and then again, sacrificing the ram for his son, and then also telling Abraham: 'Indeed, Oh Abraham, you have believed in the dream', when He gave him the station of prophethood, because the station of prophethood bestows good form and concordance and conformity to the Divine order. That is, in other words, it is because of the necessity of good form in the station of prophethood that God the High taught Abraham, in the manner mentioned, the good form both by His action and by His words, thus also teaching us the good form. In other words, when Abraham saw the ram in the image of his son and became afflicted in the order of sacrificing his son, he set about the sacrificing of his son without objection and in complete submission and concordance, and just as God the High after having given news of it redeemed him with the ram and Abraham immolated it in accordance with God's order, and just as he became cognizant of the meaning of the dream through the action of interpretation of the dream by God with the immolation of the great sacrifice, and just as with the words: 'you have believed the dream' he proceeded to slaughter his son to verify his dream without interpreting this action by the sacrifice of a ram or anything other like that in order to save his son as his *nafs* desired, so also must we be educated in accordance with the Divine good form and not let anything other emerge from us except submission and concordance to all the orders, other than God's interpretation and explanation or other than an interpretation that comes about through His order, and not interpret and explain to suit the demands of our *nafs*, and, not confining God to that image at the level of the revelation of God in images in opposition to the proofs of intellect, we should interpret the Truth according to the established ways. We knew in our dreams of the High God in an image that the intellectual proofs deny, that we should interpret such an image according to the established truth, but that we should do this in these for God according to the state of the person who sees, or according to the place that he has seen Him in, or both of these together. We became cognizant when we observed the *haqq* in such an image that the intellectual proof denies, that we should then interpret that image according to

the established truth, whether it be concerning the state of the person who sees the dream, or whether it be concerning that place in which the person who sees the dream observed the *ḥaqq*, or also, both where it concerns the person who sees the dream and the place he sees it in. That is to say, if the High God reveals Himself to us in the images of imagination of the *mithāl*, or in images of the senses, which images the intellectual proof denies and transcends God from it, for instance, if the person who sees the dream sees God in a place in a certain image, to which image there applies death, then it is necessary for us, by the necessity of good form, that in concordance with the intellectual proofs that we should interpret that image according to the established truth, either as it concerns the person who sees the dream, that is, if the one who sees the dream is a person of ill, or if he is a person of a certain place, or if he is a good-doer, or again we interpret it according to the established truth if it has to do with the place, and whether the person who sees the dream is a person of good-doings or the people of the place are bad people, or else the person who sees the dream and the place it is in together, we interpret according to the established truth, but if the seer of the dream and the place together are not of the good-doing people, then at the level of intellectual proof where images of perfection would be in lack – according to which images of perfection the religious law is established – it is all denied. Then that dream is refused because it is upon the image of completeness and perfection that the established truth has been given; and refusal (is) as in the *ḥadīth*: ‘In the Day of Judgement the *ḥaqq* reveals Himself in the image of lack and they deny Him. Then He changes into the image of completion and grandeur and they accept Him and they prostrate to Him.’

It has been recounted that in the countries of Arabia a man who was known to be pure saw God in his dream in the passages of his house and God did not show nicety to him and slapped him on the face. When that person woke up he was taken by a great alarm. However, the owner of the book, the Shaykh, God be pleased with him, gave him news of his dream. When the Shaykh saw the alarm of the person he said to him: ‘In which place did you see God?’ And that person said to him: ‘In a house that I have bought’, and the Shaykh

said to him: 'That locality is under Anger. It belongs to the established God. When you bought that place you did not ask about details of its state and you did not perform what was established for truth concerning it. Make amends for it.' Thus, when that man questioned the state of that place it came about that that place was part of a pious property in mortmain for a mosque which had been seized from it and sold. The man who bought it was not cognizant of this state of affairs. Consequently, he was not agreeable to the order of that locality, and when he found out about the order of that place he returned it again to the mortmain of the mosque and asked for forgiveness. This is why the Shaykh (R.A.) says: '. . . in an image that the intellectual proof denies', because the gnostic observes the *ḥaqq* in all images and does not transcend Him from any image. But what is meant by intellectual proof is what is acceptable by what is established as acceptable which is a deductive proof. However, this is not the intellectual proof of the people of philosophies which is mixed with *wahm*. Were it not so, whatever thing necessitated immanence (*tashbīh*) in things which arrived from the established acceptable conditions would have necessarily required refusal whether the thing that necessitated immanencing was, in relationship to the necessities of the intellectual vision, perfection or lack. And if the intellectual proof does not deny it we maintain it according to what we have seen, just like when we see the *ḥaqq* in the other world it is the same thing. That is, if the intellectual proof does not deny that image, that is to say for instance, if we see the High God revealing Himself in the image of one of the images of light, like the full moon or sun, we maintain that image exactly as we have seen it, in exactly the same way as when we see the *ḥaqq* in the other world in an image of light as a full moon we maintain it and do not interpret it, just as in the dreams, if we see Him in one of the images of light, we maintain it. Both visions are the same. There is no difference between them, and the wisdom of why both visions are the same is this, that the revelation is according to the image of the aptitude of the person revealed to. Thus, according to that aptitude the images that will happen to us in the other world as the revelation of God, when seen will not be changed, interpreted, explained or exchanged, and are known,

witnessed, cognized and prostrated to as they are. In this also, the revelation according to the images of our aptitude, when revealed to us they are understood, witnessed, cognized and prostrated to in those images without interpretation or change. Rather perhaps that when revelation and vision is established at the level of intellectual proof in the other world, the revelation and vision which happens in this case is equally in the first place necessarily submitted to because the vision which happens in the other world depends upon the aptitude which happens in the emergence of this world, because after the happening of the aptitude the vision which happens in this world is closer than the image which happens in the other world, because perhaps rather that this vision in the other world is more clearly expressed by what concerns vision as in the words of the Quran: 'He who was blind in this world is also blind in the other.' However, the acknowledgement or denial of vision which happens in the other world is due to the dogmatic beliefs of certain people, so that if God the High is revealed in concordance with a certain dogma, it is acquiesced to by those who are in accordance with that dogma, and if the revelation is according to a dogma which is different and contrary to this dogma, it is acquiesced to by the people who have that other dogma and it is denied by people who have another dogma. Yet for the people of intuition (*kashf*) and witnessing and for the people of absoluteness and being who are not limited by dogmas and bound by limit of belief, in whichever image God reveals Himself in the emergence of this world and the other world, or whichever emergence it may be, or whichever form, He is cognized, witnessed, prostrated to and praised. In every realm in which He is revealed or manifested it is the same, whether His revelations are in the images which are acceptable according to the established considerations, or intellectually, or whether they are unacceptable intellectually and according to established considerations, or whether they be unacceptable to the established law.

For the One, the Compassionate, in every realm
What there is of images which are hidden, or what
there is of it manifest.

Thus, for the Being of the One, the Compassionate (*rahmān*), who

is with His *nafs-i-rahmān* and His Being, the Extolled and Lauded, revealed and fluent in each of the essences of knowledge and realms of the unknown and of the witnessing, and equally, by virtue of the realm individualized and revealed in each of the realms, there results an image, in accordance with the realm, of all things that are hidden and all things that are manifest. That is to say, if the realm is hidden, like the Presences of meaning, the universes of spirits, the absolute *mithāl* or the conditioned *mithāl*, and other unknown realms like these, for the Being of the Compassionate (*rahmān*) images like images of knowledge, spiritual images, images of *mithāl* and images of *khayāl* and other realms like these, happen. The fact that the spiritual images, images of *mithāl* and images of *khayāl* are images of the unknown, is due to their relationship to the images of witnessing. Except that in relation to the images of essential knowledge all of these are manifested images. Each of these are in the *ghayb* in relation to what is below them, and are in the witnessing and in the senses in relationship to what is above them. If the realm is manifest and sensory its image is equally manifest and sensory. Thus, in each realm just as God's manifested image is witnessed and known, in the realms of the other world equally they are witnessed and known in the same way. However, because of the differences in the realms the images are also different. In each realm it is witnessed according to one qualification and one image. Consequently, they are witnessed in this world just as they are witnessed in the other world, and they are witnessed in the other world just as they are witnessed in this world. However, because of the images of the realms they are different. Yet the One Being of the Compassionate (*rahmān*), and the fluent and Lauded and Exalted *nafs*, are the same in all the images from the aspect of their manifestation therein.

And if you say that this (image) is the *ḥaqq*, your
 words are true,
 And if you say it is a different order, you are
 traversing.

Thus, if you say that the images which are manifested from the Being of the One and Compassionate (*rahmān*), which are revealed in all the

mirrors of the realms, are the images of the *ḥaqq*, you will be truthful in your words because the *ḥaqq* becomes manifest and the *khalq* becomes hidden, because the image is manifested which is seen in the mirror, and the mirror is hidden. This way, what is manifested in the realms is the revelation of the *ḥaqq*, and the realms remain in non-being. If you were to say it is a different order, that is to say, the seen image is the immanence, then you have crossed over and traversed from the *ḥaqq* to the immanence and from the individuated (*muta'ayyin*) to the individuating (*ta'ayyun*). Which means that you cross over and traverse from the *ḥaqq* which is witnessed in the mirror of the immanence, and that you make of the *ḥaqq* a mirror for the immanence and observe and witness the immanence in the *ḥaqq*. In this way the immanence becomes manifest and the *ḥaqq* remains interior.

And His determination is not in one realm to the
exclusion of another realm,
But it travels with the *ḥaqq* to the immanence.

That is to say, the determination of the Being of the One, the Compassionate (*rahmān*), is not exclusive to one realm and that it does not exist in another realm, but it travels and is fluent with the *ḥaqq* in the immanence (*khalq*). In other words, the revelation and determination of the *rahmān* in one realm is not different from His determination and revelation in another realm, because the relationship of all the realms to the Being of the *ḥaqq* and the *nafs-i-rahmān* is the same, manifesting in accordance with the realm in all the realms. However, the *rahmān* and the Being of the *ḥaqq*, and revelation of the consciousness and the *nafs-i-rahmān*, all together are individuated and revealed in the degree of 'amā' ('blindness') which is the interior of the First *ta'ayyun*, and then at the level of the immanence it travels into the essences of the unknown and the realities of the immanence and creaturalities which are the areas of the possibilities, and is revealed and manifested in the images of the creation. There is an allusion to a very subtle meaning in this, which is that when the revelation of the *rahmān* is revealed to the *a'yān-i-thābita* it makes the creation, which is the images of the *a'yān* in the shadow of the veils

of the *'ayn*, travel. In other words, it means that it reveals intuitively His face. In Arabic it is said: 'If he reveals his face, it is called "his face has travelled to the mirror".' In other words, the creatural images become manifest through and with the revelation of the *rahmān*. The aspect by which the Shaykh (R.A.) considers the manifestation and revelation of the *rahmān* in relationship to all the realms as equal is this, that it is because effusion of being is particular to the *rahmān*, by which, with the *nafs-i-rahmānī* revealing itself equally to all the *a'yān*, manifests His image in accordance with the essential particularity of each *'ayn*. Thus, in other words, the manifestation and revelation of the *rahmān* is equal in effusion of being upon all the *a'yān* of non-existence (*'adam*). However, manifestation by other Names is by virtue of the width of the receptivity of the *a'yān* and is not all equal. Consequently, according to this consideration there manifests a superiority among the *a'yān*.

If He were to reveal Himself to the eyes, they would
deny Him,
The intellects, by the proof upon which they are
persistent.

Were the *ḥaqq* to reveal Himself to the eyes in the images of the senses and the corporeal qualities, the veiled intellects would deny Him with such a proof upon which the intellects are assiduously persistent. That is to say, they would be continuous and assiduous because intellects necessarily transcend the *ḥaqq* through intellectual evidences. However, the transcendence of the *ḥaqq* from the images of the senses by the intellects is to immanence (*tashbīh*) Him to abstractions, whereas the *ḥaqq*, by virtue of His Ipseity and Essence, is transcended beyond transcendence and immanence, and is qualified in the degrees of the Names and Qualities with immanence and transcendence. Consequently, if God were to manifest Himself in the images which are different to the beliefs of the intellects, the intellects which are veiled with intellectual proofs would deny and negate Him, and they would limit the *ḥaqq* to the images that their proofs bestowed upon them. Consequently, while they would be transcending Him from one image, they would enter Him into another image, whereas, due to the

complete perfection of the Ipseity of the Absolute *ḥaqq*, it is out of the question that He could be immured in one or another aspect. Rather that He is perhaps hidden in each aspect and in each non-aspect. His interiority requires absoluteness and transcendence, and His manifestation, conditioning and immanencing. His Essence and Ipseity is transcendent even from being interior or manifest, because interiority or exteriority are Divine relationships, whereas the *ḥaqq*, by virtue of His Essential non-need, is Rich beyond Need of any relationship.

(But) is accepted what is in the places of revelation of the intellect and in that which is Called the *khayāl*, and the true of the visions.

This means, although the intellects would deny the revelation of the images in the universe of the senses, yet the spiritual revelation in the places of revelation of the intellect is acceptable. That is to say, the intellectuals accept the spiritual revelation which happens in the non-sensory intellectual images, and the revelation of images which happens in the thing which is called the *khayāl*, that is, in the treasures of the *khayāl*, is also acceptable on condition that these images are interpreted by a meaning which the intellect accepts. The veridic visions equally accept the revelation which occurs in the places of revelation of the intellect and of *khayāl*. By the veridic vision is meant the witnessing of the vision of the eyes which is the true *kashf* in all the realms wherein the eyes that have the vision, that is to say, the eyes which are not veiled, see the *ḥaqq* in the images of the revelations and do not circumscribe the *ḥaqq* in and by the images of the revelation. 'Today the faces are bright and alive looking to their God', that is to say, unveiled. Abu Yazid al-Bastami says in this station: 'If the Throne and that which the Throne encloses, a hundred thousand thousand times were in a corner of the corners of the heart of the gnostic, he would not feel it.' Abu Yazid al-Bastami (R.A.) says in this station, that is to say, the station of the heart, that if the Throne and that thing which the Throne encompasses were multiplied by a hundred thousand times a thousand, and was to be put into a corner of the corners of the heart of the gnostic, the gnostic could not have

felt it, because the receptivity of the heart of the *'ārif* and the perfection of his alignment is receptive to the image of a complete Divine revelation and is large for that. Thus, the heart which is receptive of the ancient does not feel the latter. The hearts which are lower than the heart of the *'ārif*, which are the receptivities of the partial hearts, are places of manifestation of partial revelations and are not according to absoluteness. And this is the width (given) to Abu Yazid (in his proclamation) in (the context of) the universe of bodies, which means, the width of the heart which is mentioned in the words of Abu Yazid is the width of Abu Yazid in the universe of bodies, that is to say, in relationship to the people veiled by the immanences Abu Yazid proclaimed the width of the heart by images of the universe of bodies, and did not proclaim it from the universe of meanings. However, I say: if His Being were not infinite and one could appreciate the end of His Being with its creative *'ayn* existent in it in one of the corners of the heart of the *'ārif*, even then he (the *'ārif*) could not have felt it in his knowledge. The Shaykh (R.A.) says, perhaps I say this thing, that His Being is not finite. If the end of His Being were ascertainable and if that thing with the *'ayn* that created it happened to be in a corner of the corners of the heart of the *'ārif*, again the *'ārif* could not have sensed it in his knowledge. Which means, as the individuations of being of immanence are from all eternity and forever not finite since there is no finitude in Divine things and the Lordly revelations, if for the individuations of infinite beings there could be appreciated an end of being with the one *'ayn* which creates all the individuations, and which is individuated by the First *ta'ayyun*, and then if it were to appear in a corner of the corners of the heart of the *'ārif*, the *'ārif* still could not have felt it in his knowledge because of the width of his receptivity and because of his being the total place of manifestation for the Being of the *ḥaqq*, and because of the *ḥaqq*'s Self-encompassment of His own Ipseity, because the heart of the verifying gnostic is in *fanā*' in the *ḥaqq* and is in the transcendence of the place of manifestation of the Absolute *ḥaqq*, and it is impossible for it to feel anything in it either by being or by knowledge. 'The immanenciation of all things in thing but immanenced because of the place', and the heart of the gnostic is a place, therefore it is also according

to transcendence. The manifestation of a thing in it is impossible. 'Everything is in annihilation except His face.' Except for the face of the Absolute *ḥaqq*, everything else, all the knowledgeable individuations and individuations of being are in annihilation therein. The Light of the Divine Ipseity inundates, encompasses and seals with its light all individuations. Consequently, how could anything that is existent or conditioned manifest in this large and absolute heart, and in what way could this heart in which it exists feel it? And it is indeed established that the heart is large enough to contain the *ḥaqq*, yet with all this it is not qualified with being quenched. Were it replete it would be quenched. With these words the Shaykh (R.A.) explains the width of the heart of the 'arif and its inability to feel anything other than the *ḥaqq*, and in the above-mentioned words of Abu Yazid assigns in a eulogistic manner a supposititious reason for the matter connected with the quality of the person eulogized, because in fact in the *ḥadīth qudsī* it is said: 'Neither My world nor My heavens is large enough, but the heart of My believing servant is large enough for Me.' With these words is established the fact that the heart of the *kāmil* is large enough for the *ḥaqq*, but all the same, although it is large enough for the *ḥaqq* and the *ḥaqq* can be contained in it by revelation, it is still not qualified with quenching. Consequently, if the heart were replete at the level of the revelation of the *ḥaqq*, it would be quenched, and this is in fact what Abu Yazid said. With these words the Shaykh (R.A.) refers to the words of Abu Yazid: 'I drank love, cup after cup. What I drank did not finish, nor was I quenched.' 'Even the man who sips the steam of the heavens and earth, and his tongue is lolling out and panting with thirst.' With these words of Abu Yazid one sees that although the heart is large enough for the successive revelations of the *ḥaqq*, it is not qualified by being quenched and awaits further and other revelations.

Now, let it be known like this, that the way that the heart is large enough for the *ḥaqq* is through the way of revelation. It so happens that sometimes the revelation is partial, and sometimes it is total. The revelation of the *ḥaqq* to the heart of the gnostic who is at the station of gnosis of the *nafs* is partial revelation, and his heart is large enough for the cognized *ḥaqq*, and nothing other than that revelation of all

the images of existence fits into it. However, the heart of the gnostic who has attained is appreciative of other images of revelation. In this way the heart of the lover who is distracted with love (*ḥaymān*), though equally large enough for the *ḥaqq* and nothing other than the *ḥaqq* can fit into it, it is not replete with the effusions of the Divine revelations which arrive upon it, and because of the strength of his love and perfection of his passion, is expectant of the effusions of further revelations: Consequently, the heart that Abu Yazid mentions is the heart of the *ʿārif* and the lover and the love-struck. However, the heart of the absolute Perfect Man who is in the place of manifestation of the collectivity of the Divine Ipseity which is the place of the *taʿayyun* of the Divine Names and Qualities and the source of the effusion of the infinite revelations, its determination is different. That is why the Shaykh (R.A.), when explaining about the heart which was wide enough for the *ḥaqq* but not quenched, said the words: 'And this is in fact what Abu Yazid said', thus referring these words to Abu Yazid and pointing at the heart of the Perfect Man, because the heart that Abu Yazid mentioned is of different determination to the determination of the heart of the *kāmil*, because for the heart of the *kāmil* there is no definite condition or conditioned situation, and it is not receptive of partial revelation as the revelation of the *ḥaqq* would then be by virtue of the heart, whereas it is rather that the heart is by virtue of the Absolute *ḥaqq*. However, what is obvious here is this, that the Shaykh (R.A.), by saying: 'And this is in fact what Abu Yazid said', expresses the fact that what he expresses is larger, more prevalent, more general and more perfect, meaning that this is what Abu Yazid says, and this is what I mention, which is more comprehensive than what he said, and the final issue of the width of the heart will be proclaimed, God willing, in the Wisdom of Shuʿayb. And we have in fact drawn attention to this station by our words:

Oh Creator of things in His own Self,
You collect in You all You have created.

This means that in fact we have drawn attention to this station, that is, that the heart of the gnostic is large enough for God but cannot feel in its knowledge the infinite creation, with what we have said. Oh

Creator of things in His own *nafs*, that is to say, in His own Knowledge, which at the station of Uniqueness is the same as His own Ipseity. He is the Creator of things in the images of knowledge and manifests them in the beings of the essences, and by this consideration He is the Creator of the beings of potentialities. All that You have created, You have collected in Your own *nafs*. Your manifestation in the degrees of knowledge and the Unknowable is the aspect by which God's creation of things in His own *nafs* is the manifestation and *yaqīn* of His Being in the degrees of existence. Thus, individuation in His Being is creation, and under the consideration of His manifestation in all the individuations He collects the totality of the creation in His Being, since the creation is the same as His Being, and the totality of the images of creation is the collectivity of His Singularity. There is nothing outside it, and nothing from outside enters it.

**You create that which is not finite, whose being
Is in You, and You are both Narrow and Large.**

Through the aspect of Your individuation in the images of knowledge which are in the Presence of Knowledge, You create that thing whose being is not finite, and by consideration of Your manifestation in the images of creation and in the Presences of the potentialities and essences, thus You are both Narrow and Large, that is to say, Narrow because of Your being conditioned in each of the images of the creation, and Large because of Your manifestation in the images of totality. He is Narrow to be comprehensive with the existence of knowledge and encompassing by His Ipseity through His Uniqueness of Ipseity which is dominant in all the images of the creaturality and which dominates again the individuations of knowledge and the images of Names and Qualities, because the totality of the individuations are in narrowness and compression at the level of individuations of Names of Uniqueness of Ipseity, and are conditioned in the narrowness of non-being. But He is Large because of manifesting by virtue of place in each of the images of creaturality after having effused being into the potentialities which were in non-being in the narrowness of the Uniqueness of Ipseity. Consequently Large, because He is Large because of the consideration of His comprehensiveness

by His Being, and Large over all, having collected in Himself the infinite creatural images which are in His own Being, together with His oneness. Equally, He is Narrow for the manifestation in Him of the images of the individuated beings, because the individuated images and conditioned images, under the consideration of their being conditioned in the absoluteness and non-individuation, cannot fit, and they become unstable and dispersed, and under this condition the word 'narrow' means 'the One who makes Narrow, or Narrower'. Again He is Large, as mentioned, by consideration of His comprehensiveness of the totality of all existence.

If that which God has created (were in my heart),
would not
Abound in my heart its elevated resplendent light.

In this stanza there is transposition, and it would read: if what God has created in His Being were in my heart, the resplendent light would not abound therein. If what God the High has created in His Being were present in my heart the diffusive light of dawn of that thing, that is to say, its elevated light, would not reflect in my heart, which means the light which extends to all the existents and the totality of creations and which diffuses into all the existents, the shine of that light of being would not reflect in my heart and would not be manifested therein. That is to say, the brilliance of the light of being which is resplendent in all the existents and expanded to the totality of creation would not abound in my heart and would not be manifested, because even though the light of being, which is resplendent in the totality of the creation, which through the consideration of the law of God's fluency and individuation and manifestation in the creation is the Light of God which is manifest like a resplendent dawn in all of them, even though it branches out with the images of creaturality, yet in the heart of the *kāmil*, which is polished beyond the images of creaturality and freed and polished beyond the influences of supposition and intellect, at the level of the revelation of the *ḥaqq* with the collectivity of Its Ipseity and Qualities and Names, and at the level of the drowning of the heart in that revelation, and the drowning of revelations, there is no manifestation of the light of being.

If it is large enough to contain the *ḥaqq*, and it did not narrow from
The creation (*khalq*), how then is the order, Oh you listener?

When the heart is large enough for the *ḥaqq* which is large enough for all the things with Its Ipseity and Qualities and Names, that heart, that heart of the Perfect Man, did not become narrowed due to and from (containing also) the creation. How then is the order, Oh listener? That is to say, the *ḥaqq* does not fit into the heavens and the earth but fits into the heart of the perfect believer, and that heart which becomes large enough for God, how could it be narrower than the heavens and the earth and other creatures? Thus the Shaykh (R.A.) in these four stanzas draws attention to the fact that the Perfect Man's heart is in such a degree in width that it is large enough for the Absolute God. Consequently, how can the things which are created in the *nafs* of the *ḥaqq* contain the width of the heart, and how equally can that heart be in narrowness because of them? Consequently, at the level of the heart's largeness for the *ḥaqq*, first of all the heart becomes large enough for all that is created in the *nafs* of the *ḥaqq*. Consequently, there is nothing of *ḥaqq* or *khalq* for which the heart of the *kāmil* person is not large enough. And if there arises a question in there not being the resplendent light of dawn in the heart at the level of the Divine revelation in the heart, he (the Shaykh) says that the heart which is large enough for the *ḥaqq* does not become too narrow for the *khalq*, which means it is also large enough for the *khalq*. People might question that there is contradiction. The aspect of the heart of the perfect gnostic both to the *ḥaqq* and the *khalq* is this, that when the *ḥaqq* reveals Himself into the heart with His Names and Qualities and the heart is big enough for that, it is equally big enough for the images of creaturality which are included in the Names and Qualities, because the Names and Qualities do not become realized except by their places of manifestation which are the images of creation. Consequently, if it is large enough for the Names and Qualities, it is also large enough for their places of manifestation which are the images of creaturality which are the created things in

praise of the *ḥaqq*. The heart of the *kāmil* is large enough for the *ḥaqq* and the *khalq*, and collects the *ḥaqq* and the *khalq*. There is nothing which is outside the being of the Perfect Man, because the perfection of the Perfect Man is because of this collectivity. If by virtue of the apposition of the heart of the Perfect Man to God, God's revelation therein is considered; then the fact that the images of creaturality do not abound in there is not due to the fact that the images of creaturality which are created in the *nafs* of the *ḥaqq* are not existent in it, because when the heart is large enough for the *ḥaqq*, it is equally large enough for the things which are created in the *nafs* of the *ḥaqq*. So understand!

With *wahm* Man creates in the power of his *khayāl* that which has no being except in that, and this is how the order is generally. The Shaykh (R.A.) with these words creates an example for his previous words: 'Oh Creator of things in His own *nafs*', which means that each man through his *wahm* creates in the power of his *khayāl* a thing which has no being except in the power of his *khayāl*, which means that outside of the power of his *khayāl* it has no existence. To create in the *wahm* is a general order and appertains both to the gnostic and the non-gnostic. However, the creation of the '*ārif*' is different to the creation of the non-'*ārif*'. The '*ārif*' creates by *himma* that which has a being outside of the place of the *himma*. That is to say, it has existence outside, and the *himma* of the gnostic is never removed from preserving that which is created, and its preservation is not a burden to him, that is, preserving that which is created. If ever it happened to the gnostic to be unaware of the preservation of what he has created, that creature becomes non-existent, unless the '*ārif*' has already seized all the Presences, because then he is never absolutely unconscious of it. Without a doubt he will be witnessing it from a Presence. This means that the gnostic can create through his *himma* something which has a being outside the place of the *himma*, and for that thing being happens, that is to say, it exists outside. But then the '*ārif*'s *himma* is never removed from preserving it, and preserving it, that is to say, preserving that which is created, does not render the *himma* heavy. And if ever the gnostic is forgetful of preserving it, that creature stops being existent because the continuity

(*istimrār*) of the being of that thing is dependent on the non-interruption (*istimrār*) of the thing that causes it, unless of course the gnostic has seized all the Divine Presences of immanence, then that thing does not cease to exist because the *'ārif* does not ever become forgetful completely of the creature because he preserves all the Presences. It is perhaps that he preserves it from one of the Presences, and because of this witnessing his creation remains existent.

Now let it be known like this, that the *himma* of the gnostic for the creation of a thing is this: the gnostic, with the ease and presence of the heart, at the level of the collectivity of thought, collecting all powers and *himma* and ideas, applies himself to the creation of that thing, and that thing becomes existent like any other existent outside the heart which is the place of the *himma*, just as Asaf obliterated the throne of Bilqis in Saba and created its equivalent in the presence of Solomon, and just as the throne became existent and sensible outside, the gnostic, in the same way, with the power of holiness and Divine relationship, creates a thing, and that thing, like other creations from the Essence, becomes existent and sensible outside the realm of the *khayāl* and outside the place of the *himma*. In the same way, he creates the spiritual images by which he enters with them into the universe of spirits. On the other hand, anyone from the general run of people with imagination and *wahm* can bring about something in their hearts, but as they are devoid of powers of holiness and spirituality they will not be able to arrange that brought-about form from every aspect and manifest it in the exterior. Thus, the fact that the creation of the gnostic exists outside the place of the *himma* is due to the gnostic's completion and perfection, and the spirit of that which is created by the gnostic is the *himma* of that gnostic, and the *himma* is not removed from preserving it. However, if the gnostic underwent a moment of forgetfulness of what he created, that is to say, if he were to pass from the universe in which that thing is existent to another universe wherein that thing is veiled, in other words, that he is forgetful of its preservation, or even if his heart turned to another thing and his *himma* is spent on a different order, that created thing becomes non-existent because that thing is present through the spirit of the *himma* of the gnostic and because his *himma* is cut away from that,

unless of course the gnostic be one of those who has conquered all the Divine and immanental Presences and encircled them. In that case, if the gnostic transfers to another universe from the universe in which that creature is present, and in one way he is negligent of the preservation of that creature, yet in all aspects he is never absolutely ignorant of it because the image of the thing which the 'ārīf who has encompassed all the Presences has created with his *himma* is manifested in all Presences. Thus, to whichever Presence he is transferred, by preserving the image which is manifest in that Presence he preserves the image of that creature in the first universe, and equally he preserves the images which are manifested in all other Presences. The perfect or the complete gnostic is certainly witnessing one of the Presences at any time from all the Presences. When the gnostic through his *himma* creates whatever he creates and he has the encompassing, this creation manifests in every *ḥadra* in its image, and he preserves some of these images, and if it ever happens that the gnostic is forgetful of a Presence or of several Presences yet he is in witness of one Presence from among the Presences and he preserves therein the image of what he has created, all the images are preserved by the preserving of this one image in the Presence that he did not forget about, because in fact forgetfulness is never general, either in general or particular. Thus, if the 'ārīf has created through his *himma* a thing, whatever thing that may be that he has created, and for that thing there happens a complete encompassment of Presences, that creature becomes manifest in each Presence in its image, and he preserves some of these images, and if ever the gnostic is oblivious of a specific Presence or of several Presences, that is to say, if the gnostic is oblivious of one Presence while he is himself present with the image of that thing that he has created in one of the Presences from among the Presences, then while he is witnessing one Presence from among the Presences, that thing which results from the image of what he has created is maintained in that Presence, and because the 'ārīf preserves that one image all the images in all the Presences are preserved because he has not been oblivious of that Presence, because oblivion is never general either in the generality or the specific. This is why there is never a generality of oblivion or of unawareness in general. The

reason why the forgetfulness is never general is this, because it is not necessary to be forgetful of all the Presences if one is forgetful of one Presence. Rather that he only is forgetful of some, and the reason why it is not general in particular is this, that if he is neglectful of one *ḥadra*, in another aspect he is not neglectful because being forgetful in one *ḥadra* but being present in other *ḥadarāt* preserves the image of the thing created in the *ḥadra* wherein he is present even though he is forgetful of the original Presence, and because he is present in one or several of the *ḥadarāt* and thereby preserves the image of what he has created in those Presences, the images of that which is created are also preserved in the original Presence and in all the Presences. Therefore, the forgetfulness or neglect which happens in a specific Presence is equally not general. One can interpret this also in a different way, this question of general and specific, by the people in general and the special people. If the general or the special people create something and witness something in the *khayāl* or in the intellect, it is not possible for them to observe one image necessarily in one specific Presence. Thus forgetfulness is never general. However, according to this consideration, if forgetfulness were not general in the generality of the people then it would be necessary that the generality of the people also, who observe a certain image in one Presence without being forgetful of it in that one Presence, could not be qualified with forgetfulness also where other Presences are concerned. However, the generality of people who create things in the power of *khayāl* through *wahn*, these things that they have created have no existence outside the power of *khayāl*. What good then does this do that this sort of forgetfulness is not general, since the thing created has no existence outside the *khayāl*? And how could they preserve the image which is in the power of the *khayāl* as an image outside the power of the *khayāl* when they are forgetful of the image within the power of the *khayāl*? Consequently, directly they are forgetful of the *khayāl*, that *khayāl* image equally becomes non-existent, unless of course that all this is mentioned with insistence, that is, that the forgetfulness is not general, to show that the gnostic, when he is forgetful of one Presence at one level, he is still observant of another Presence, thereby his forgetfulness is not general. Or it can be that this is mentioned because: in

the understanding of the generality forgetfulness is not general like it has been mentioned before; it is equally not general in the understanding of the special people of God because in their understanding all the images are Divine manifestations. Consequently, forgetfulness cannot be general.

Now, let it be known like this, that the Shaykh (R.A.) has mentioned creation in this place according to four different ways. One kind is of the realm of *wahm*, and that has no existence outside the power of *khayāl*. The second kind is through the application of *himma*, and, as explained, it has existence outside. However, if the owner of the *himma* is forgetful of it, it becomes non-existent. The third kind is the creation of the complete gnostic who seizes all the Presences, whose creation also exists outside, and if the gnostic is forgetful of that existent creature in the Presence wherein it is existent, its existence remains. The fourth kind is the true creation which is specific to God, and the difference between God's creation and that which the gnostic has brought about through his *himma* is this: for the gnostic to preserve the image of the thing he has invented generally in all the images is not possible. Rather, he preserves some of the images, and the rest of the images are preserved due to those others which have been preserved. The creation of God the High is in all detail continuously in the preservation of God, and forgetfulness does not happen to Him in the preservation of His creation: 'And their preservation is no burden unto Him who is the High and the Grand.' There is only this, that there are in the images of the elements which are the creation of God, changes. If *fanā'* comes to one of these images that which is individuated in that image manifests in the latter image. This is like the relationship of the emergence of the images of this world to the emergence of the images of the other world. However, the images of Nature are different to the elemental images. The High God willing, if it arrives to the heart it shall be mentioned in a different place. In fact, I have explained of this a mystery which does not pass away even though the people of God have refrained from exposing things like this. In fact I have here explained a great mystery, upon the likes of which mystery are the people of God; even though they tried to do their utmost not to manifest it they did not

get away from it, which means that they covered it, doing their best to prevent it from manifesting. That is to say, even though they know it they have refrained from exposing this, and covered it up. When there is denial of their pretension that they are the *ḥaqq*, which means that they refrain from the exposition of this, because in the exposition of this there is negation of the pretension that they are the *ḥaqq*, because there is a kind of people from among the people of God who do *taṣarruf* in the universe and who are people of closeness through supererogatories, who do the dispensing by virtue of their qualification with the Divine Qualities while there still are in their beings remainders of themselves. Although also they say: 'In our being there is nothing other than the Reality. Our dispensing is God's dispensing', in this pretension there is negation because according to what has been mentioned there is a difference between their dispensing and the dispensing of the *ḥaqq*. Thus, those people of God who are of this kind defer the exposition of this so that the interfering enemies do not come to know of it and keep on questioning them. What a pity though, that this kind of people of God take this attitude and defer in this matter. Rather they should have perhaps conformed to the words: 'Take Us as your *wakīl*', and taken God as their *wakīl* in all orders and not attempted at dispensing (*taṣarruf*) and left appointed Viceregent in dispensing only God. And indeed God is never forgetful (of anything), but it is impossible for the servant not to be forgetful of one thing or another. God the Absolute is never ever forgetful of anything He has created, but for the conditioned servant it is beyond doubt that he shall be forgetful of certain things and not of others. Thus, there is established a difference between the *ḥaqq* and the servant, and difference is apparent between the creation of God and the creation of the servant, and the preservation by God and preservation by the servant. From the point of view of preserving, when he has created, for him it is to say: 'I am the *ḥaqq*', but his preservation of it is not like the preservation of God. It is true that the servant can say: 'I am the *ḥaqq*' as far as preserving what he has created is concerned, but the preserving of a thing as created by a servant is not the same kind as God's preservation of the image of His creation. Thus, for the servant to say the words: 'I am God' is not

absolute because it concerns the preservation of his creation. Thus to say 'I am God' in the absolute sense is specific to God alone. In fact we have shown the difference, meaning that in fact we have explained the difference between God and the servant, and God's lack of forgetfulness, and by explaining the servant's forgetfulness in one aspect, also by showing that the servant's preservation is not the same as the *haqq's* preservation, because God's preservation is by virtue of His non-forgetfulness and the servant's preservation is by virtue of an aspect of forgetfulness. That is, by virtue of when he is forgetful of an image and its Presence, definitely there is a difference between the servant and the *haqq*, and without a doubt he is differentiated in the retaining of preservation in all the images by his preservation of one image from among them in the Presence of which he is not forgetful. Due to the fact that he is forgetful of an image and its Presence, indeed (again) the servant is differentiated from the *haqq* without a doubt. Thus indeed the servant is differentiated from the *haqq*. However, the differentiation of the servant from the *haqq* (in any case) is without a doubt (even) by the perseverance of the preservation of all the images by the preservation of the image of one of them in its Presence, of which he has not become unaware. The aspect of the servant's being differentiated from the *haqq* by virtue of his not being forgetful of one image in its *hadra* is in this. What this means is that the servant is differentiated from the *haqq* and the aspect of the differentiation of the servant from the *haqq* is this, because the servant can observe only one image and its Presence and he is unaware of other images and their Presences whereas the *haqq* is observant of all the images of His creation in all the Presences and is not unaware of any one of the images. It is also possible to read it like this, that the servant is differentiated from the *haqq* due to the fact that the servant is not forgetful of the image of the thing he has created in one of the images of one of the Presences from among all the images in all the Presences. Thus the first aspect is clear and manifest but this aspect is also eloquent, because at the level of the forgetfulness of the servant there is differentiation apparent among all servants, but this is all due to the fact of the servant's not forgetting absolutely. Thus, there appears a subtle difference between the two explanations, and to

explain this second differentiation is equally eloquent because the differentiation subsequent to not forgetting necessitates the differentiation necessitated by forgetfulness. But in this case there is not such necessity, which means that there is difference apparent between the servant and the *ḥaqq* when the servant is preserving all the images and while that preservation is persistent in him by virtue of preserving one image in that Presence of which he is not forgetful. It is possible for someone to argue and question and say after all this explanation that even though the difference in forgetfulness is explained there is no apparent difference in the matter of preservation, because just as God preserves the image of His own creation the servant equally preserves the image of his creation in one of the Presences from among the Presences by virtue of his not being forgetful of that Presence. The words of the Shaykh (R.A.) are an answer to this expected question, wherein he underlines that even in this case there is a difference between the servant and God when he adds: **Because this is preservation through being comprised in a larger expression, which means the preservation by the servant is through being comprised in a situation and not by purpose or particularization, which means, by preserving the image which is in the Presence which is in the servant's witnessing he preserves the images in all the Presences, even though he was forgetful of the other Presences as he passes from one Presence to another, and God's preservation of all that He created is not like this. In fact He preserves all the images according to certainty (*yaqīn*). And the *ḥaqq*'s preservation of all the things He has created is not through being comprised in a larger expression. Rather it is that His preservation of every image is in accordance with His particularization, and His knowledge of all things is equal, which means that His preservation of all images is due to His particularization, and His knowledge of all things is in the same way. And this is the question I have been informed of (by God). No one has written this in a book ever before, neither me nor other than me, except in this book, and this (matter) is the sole thing of value of (appertaining to) this time and its singularity. That is to say that the complete and perfect gnostic, having encompassed all the Presences, is then neglectful of one Presence in one aspect, but because of his non-forgetfulness of all**

of the Presences and the images that are manifest in them due to his non-forgetfulness of a Presence whose image he observes, he thereby retains all the Presences and their images; and the fact that he is yet differentiated from the *ḥaqq* in this matter (of the *ḥaqq* also retaining all the images in all the Presences) is that of which I have been informed from the side of the *ḥaqq*, which nobody else has ever written in a book, neither me nor another than me, except that I wrote it in this book. Thus, this matter is the sole thing of value of this time and its singularity, which explains the Divine relationship of the perfect gnostic and the aspect of his servanthood. The perfect gnostic is in a degree wherein he is at the witnessing and presence certainly of a Presence from among the Presences by his Divine relationship. Consequently, observing an image in that Presence and preserving it, he also preserves them and observes them (those images) equally in other Presences because the Presences are attached one to the other. Thus, that one Presence is like a mirror to the other Presences. Consequently, the images that are in all the Presences, together with the knowledges and determinations and gnosés and tastes, are observed in that one Presence, and this line (just written) is the aspect of Lordship and the Divine relationship of the gnostic. On the other hand, because of the aspect of his absolute servanthood and dependency by which the gnostic is non-existent (*'adam*) by his own being and is existent only through the Being of the *ḥaqq*, the gnostic is consequently differentiated from the *ḥaqq* by this aspect. The height and importance of this matter is in the fact that the gnostic, by his witnessing of one Presence, remains non-neglectful of all the Presences, and again, conformity to and respect for absolute servanthood is to explain the difference between the gnostic and the *ḥaqq*, because happiness is in the collectivity of both of the above-mentioned places of abode. That is why the Shaykh (R.A.), addressing the *'arīf* who understands this matter, added: Be careful not to be forgetful of that, and indeed such a Presence in which is made to persist for you the Presences with the image in them, that is to say, indeed that Presence which causes to persist for you the Presences with an image, or else again, indeed that Presence in which there is made to remain for you Presences with an image, or again, which means that Presence in which you are present

with one image over many Presences, and in that Presence you observe that image, and by preserving that you preserve the images of all things which are created in all the images, this resembles the Book for which God said: 'In it We have left out nothing.' (This refers to the Guarded Tablets for which God has said: 'In it We have left out nothing'), meaning that He collected in it all things. And it collects all that has happened and that which has not happened, which means that that Book contains everything that has already happened from all eternity, and all that which has not yet happened but will happen until all eternity. Consequently, the gnostic who encompasses all the Presences, maintaining and preserving the image of his creation in one Presence through his witnessing that Presence preserves the images of that creation in all the Presences, and all images are included in that one image. Thus, that one Presence is like the Evident Book which collects all things, where no image remains outside it. No one knows what we have said except he be *qur'ān* in his own self, which means, the Perfect Man, who having comprehended the totality of the Divine and immanential Presences collects in himself the Divine image and the creatural image, who is *qur'ān* himself, collects the totality of things, and the totality of things are attached one to the other in his being. Thus, being in gnosis of the collectivity of his own self he witnesses taste where that one Presence collects the totality of Presences, and the gnostic who is not ignorant of that one Presence and its image preserves all the Presences and their images. Consequently, he does not know the predication of the Presence which is like the *qur'ān* for all Presences except he is the *qur'ān* in his own self, because he is the possessor of the collectivity of singularity. If he were to become lost from his creation in one Presence, he will witness it in a Presence which is higher than that Presence which would be in the witnessing of that Presence and its preservation, and that Presence becomes like that Book in which is collected all that has happened and all which has not happened but will happen in the future. Consequently, the gnostic who knows that that Presence is the Book which collects everything, is gnostic by being *qur'ān* in his own self. Those who are pious people by common usage are people of discrimination and they are righteous and duly perform their religious act. They have

no awareness of the *qur'ān* and collectivity, and the people of the *qur'ān* are the *muqarrabīn*. There is resultant for them the highest *qur'ān*, and their devotion is the highest degree and the most collective degree of devotion, like the words of the Envoy (S.A.): 'My God, indeed I take refuge in You from You.' And indeed for the devoted, God brings to him the discrimination, because he who is devoted to God, that is, the gnostic who holds a protection for God, God the High discriminates for him. That is, He implants in his heart a light by which he differentiates between truth and falsehood, and with that light he differentiates the *ḥaqq* from the *khalq*, and devotion itself is discrimination because the devoted holds himself devotedly away from attributing the *khalq* to the *ḥaqq* and thus differentiates between *khalq* and *ḥaqq*, and in accordance with this it would be like: 'Indeed those who devote themselves, God brings to them discrimination.' However, the use of: 'And indeed for the devoted . . .' is in continuation and conjunction of: 'No one knows what we have said . . .', and the manifest meaning becomes this, that nobody knows what we have said except that person who is the *qur'ān* in himself because the one who devotes himself to God (according to what is mentioned above) maintains discrimination for God, which means that he establishes existence for the creation and differentiates the *ḥaqq* from the creation.

Now let it be known like this, that there are degrees established for devotion. The devotion of the general public is to refrain from what is forbidden, and the devotion of the select is to refrain from attributing completion to their own selves and attributing any ill to the *ḥaqq*. The devotion of the perfect ones is to refrain from establishing existence essentially, qualificatively and actively to anything other than the Being of God, and the supreme degree of devotion is travel to God which comes before arriving at the station of collectivity. However, for the servant the devotion at travel to God and with God happens at the level of remaining (*baqā'*) after *fanā'*. For each kind of devotion there is discrimination which is its necessity, and then the highest discrimination is at the station of discrimination after collectivity which is the discrimination of the complete and perfect heir which respects all degrees. And this is like what we have mentioned in this matter wherein is differentiated the servant from the Lord,

and this is the discrimination which is the highest discrimination, which means that the discrimination of the devoted is like the discrimination we have mentioned in this matter by which the servant becomes differentiated from the Lord, and the discrimination we have mentioned in this matter is the highest discrimination, and the only reason why the discrimination of the devoted is like the discrimination of the possessor of collectivity and *qur'ān* is in the matter of differentiation between the servant and the *ḥaqq*. That is to say, it is similar in the fact of differentiating between the *ḥaqq* and the servant. However, the discrimination of the devoted is lower than the discrimination of the possessor of *qur'ān*, and this latter's discrimination is higher. That is why the Shaykh says: '. . . this is the discrimination which is the highest discrimination', because at the station of discrimination after collectivity is the discrimination of the perfect heir, where, while the *ḥaqq* is manifest in the servant with the Divine collectivity and the servant is the total place of manifestation for Him, God's Essential Necessarily-so-ness is differentiated from the servant's essential dependence. It is also possible to understand it this way, that the discrimination of the Perfect Man, who is in himself the *qur'ān*, is similar to the discrimination mentioned in this matter in that it differentiates between the servant and the Lord, and this is the highest discrimination. Thus, the gnostic is not differentiated from the *ḥaqq* at the degree of collectivity, but when he descends to the station of discrimination after collectivity to establish the degree of differentiation between the *ḥaqq* and the *khalq*, being qualified with a quality from among the creatural qualities such as being qualified by being completely dependent on the *ḥaqq* in being, and the quality of discrimination becoming preponderant in him, he becomes differentiated from the *ḥaqq* and manifests with servanthood.

And sometimes the servant manifests as the Lord
without a doubt,

And sometimes the servant manifests as the servant truly.

At times without a doubt the servant becomes the Lord in consideration of his manifestation with the Divine Qualities and Lordly relationships. That is to say, the Perfect Man by way of caliphate with

the Divine Names exercises Lordship over the universes. At other times he is truly a servant when he is manifested with inability and dependency and absolute servanthood and because he is qualified with absolute servanthood. In other words, for the person who has collected between the grand servanthood and the great Lordship, it is as if at the level of his caliphate from God that he had become a servant for God and become a Lord for the universes, and the wisdom of his being servant at times is this, that after God has made him a caliph (regent) over the universes the man becomes realized with absolute servanthood and complete knowledge and appoints the *ḥaqq* as his *wakīl* and caliph and commits the charge of the order to Him, as the Envoy (S.A.) said: 'My God, You are the Possessor in the journey, and the Caliph at the present', and he pointed at this station with these words. The aspect of his being a Lord at other times is this: God has taken him as successor regent over the universes and the regent is the image of He who appoints him as regent. Consequently, being manifest over the universes with the Divine Image and Lordly Qualities he becomes the Lord over the universes by manifesting his Lordship over the universes from the place of manifestation of the Divine Names. Thus, Man combines in himself Lordship and servanthood. However, his Lordship is an accidental non-essential occurrence and his servanthood is essential.

If (in fact the complete servant) is servant he is
enlarged with God,
And if (in fact the complete servant) is the Lord he
has a hard life.

Thus, if the servant is a perfect servant he expands with the *ḥaqq*, that is to say, if he is successor to God and is established at the centre of absolute servanthood he becomes expanded and enlarged with the *ḥaqq* because he is under God's guarantee and is the proxy for God and God educates him with veridic essential Lordship. That is to say, God becomes large for him in everything that he needs with dispensing and revelation, and he in turn becomes large for God and becomes large to things with God, in accordance with the quote: 'My earth and My heavens are not large enough for Me but the heart of

My believing servant is large enough', and being qualified with absolute and complete servanthood and total dependence he collects in himself the collectivity of the Essential Divine Names and his heart becomes large enough for the Ipseity and Quality of *ḥaqq* and becomes manifest from his place of manifestation in the most suitable and perfect and highest and most wise aspects to the Divine actions and Lordly determinations. However, he is not in requirement of Divine perfections which are established for God by virtue of his being qualified by absolute servanthood and by virtue of his absolute refraining from raising himself to Lordship, and he is not manifest with his own being, nor with dispensing. He is transcended from the degree of dispensing by his own being, because in dispensing he has made God his regent and proxy. On the other hand, if the perfect servant becomes Lord he is in the hard life because if he manifests with the Lordly Qualities he becomes needy of the gift of nourishment. Thus, being in need of getting nourishment, at times he is consequently in a narrow life, because where it concerns being, richness-beyond-need, action, effect and effusion of the *ḥaqq*, these are Essential Qualities, whereas non-being and being acted-upon and being effected and being dependent and being receptive are essential qualities for the servant. Thus the servant by essence is needy, even though incidentally he is powerful by the power of God, or at the time of the qualification with servanthood and dependency, which are the qualities of servanthood, he manifests with incapacity and need when he is needy of the effusion and help which are the qualities of Lordship. The following two lines, together with the two other stanzas that follow, are in explanation and exposition of the stanzas that have passed.

And from his immanence as a servant he sees the same as
himself,
And all desires are made ample from him without a doubt.

Thus, as the servant is an absolute servant qualified with the qualities of servanthood, he witnesses the same as his own essence. That is to say, he sees his own essence as in need and unable. He even sees his non-being (*'adam*), and then all desires are enlarged from him

without a doubt because the Divine Names have found liberation from the narrowness of oneness, and the immanential potentialities have found liberation from the narrowness of non-being by his being the place of manifestation, because with the Being of God he is large for *ḥaqq* and the *khalq*. Or this line could also be understood as: the desires of the servant in God become amplified and enlarged from the *ḥaqq*, and whatever he asks for with the language of aptitude, it is immediately plentifully passed over from the Being of the expanded *ḥaqq*, 'and We gave them of all that they asked for'.

And as a Lord in his immanence he sees all the creation
And what they ask for from the Presence of the
universe of possessions and the angelic universe.

That is to say, by way of being the Viceregent, manifesting with Lordship and dispensing (*taṣarruf*), he sees all the creation from the Presence of possessions and the universe of angels who demand of him, that is to say, they demand of him their sensory and spiritual nourishment, because he is the Caliph. Consequently, every one of the subjects, by virtue of desert and aptitude, demands of him their portion, and it is necessary for him to give to each their desert.

And he is incapable in his own essence of what they
require of him.

It is because of this that some of the gnostics who
know this complain.

That is to say, the servant, while he is complete and perfect with the Being of the *ḥaqq*, is incapable of giving what they require of him through his own essence as that thing is not effectively present at his level, as that thing which is required is not really his. Consequently, weakness, which is his essential non-being and his original creation, and absolute servanthood, which is being dependent and in need, are in opposition to Lordship which is God's quality. What they require of the perfect servant results from the manifestation of the perfect servant with the qualities of Lordship, and when he looks upon absolute servanthood he sees that he cannot give what is required because total *fanā'* and absolute servanthood is in opposition to facing towards

dispensing. Because of this you see some of the gnostics complain. When he manifests with servanthood and the quality of inability the dispensing and giving which comes about in his place of manifestation belongs to the *haqq* and to the Names and the Divine Qualities, and he has no place in that dispensing. Consequently, the manifestation of the perfect servant with the qualities of inability is at the time when he turns his face to Lordship and his manifestation with needs is when he looks at the same time at his own absolute servanthood. On the other hand, he who has made the Lord his proxy and taken Him as his regent in the things that are required, according to the requisites of absolute servanthood, without even rising to Lordship, and being manifest with the determination of total *fanā'*, he is not incapable because he has committed all orders to God and taken Him as his proxy, and at his level dispensing and not dispensing is all the same, rather perhaps even that non-dispensing is preferable.

The Shaykh (R.A.) in chapter 22 of the *Futūḥāt* says that nobody knows the wonderful taste of being qualified by servanthood except at the level of his being qualified by Lordship he has tasted the worries of that position where the creation needs him, like Solomon (S.A.), who at one time asked that God the High give upon his hands physically the nourishment of the servants of God, that is to say, that it reached them through his hands. Thus Solomon (S.A.) at that time collected everything of nourishment which was present. Then a creature came out of the sea and asked of Solomon his sustenance, and Solomon (S.A.) said to that animal: 'Every day take from this collected sustenance that which is necessary for your sustenance.' The animal ate all that had been collected of sustenance. That is to say, he ate all the sustenance that was collected by Solomon for the totality of the servants and finished it. Then he turned to Solomon and said to him: 'Why did you not give me all my nourishment completely? The great God gives me every day ten times as much nourishment as this, and there are beings, animals, who are greater than me and whose nourishment is much more than mine.' Solomon (S.A.) fully regretted what he had asked of God and knew that largesse does not exist in the creature which is suitable to the creator, because Solomon (S.A.) had asked of God a possession which would not be suitable to

anyone after him. Consequently, he asked for his request to be recalled and overlooked when he saw the order of this animal, and from every quarter the animals demanding their nourishment, collecting upon Solomon, there became great difficulty for Solomon to supply them with their nourishment. That is how he prayed to God for the annulment of this and for it to be overlooked, and God accepted his prayer and annulled his agreement. When he was relieved of giving the nourishment he found the taste the quality of which cannot be esteemed. Here end the words of the Shaykh.

Now let it be known like this, that it is lack of good form for the servant to manifest with the qualities of the Lord, unless his Lord qualifies Himself with the qualities of the servant and manifests with humility of qualification, and His descent to the qualities of the servant is only to show kindness and goodness. If God the High makes a servant master over other servants, even then there is no manifestation with Lordship at their level. The Prophet (S.A.) said: 'I am the best Lord of the children of Adam and there is no point of pride in this', and as God says: 'The house of the other world is not brought for possession to those who have shown height on earth because God has brought the earth low, and the servant is low, and his lowness does not necessitate height. He who transgresses, his desert is annihilation.'

**You be the servant of the Lord and do not be Lord of
His servant**

**So that you are not on the way to becoming caught by
the fire or the smelting pot.**

This is to say that servanthood is the most honoured station and the highest of the degrees, as according to: 'Serve your Lord until He grants you the *yaqīn*', and: 'Prostrate yourself to your Lord and approach Him.' What he means by: 'Do not be Lord of His servant' is, do not manifest with Lordship over the servants of God so that you do not get caught to the way of the fire of inability and the cauldron of pain, meaning so that you do not, because of being caught by Lordship, go on the way of the fire of inability to be melted in the fire. If the address: 'Be the servant of the Lord and do not be Lord of His

servant' is addressed to the Perfect Man, who is manifest with Lordship and servanthood at the station of caliphate, what is meant by 'fire' is the fire of inability and non-ability by one's own essence. However, the inability of the perfect is in relationship to himself. It is not in view of the power and strength of the dispensing of God in his place of manifestation. Otherwise there would have appeared no act from the Perfect Man. For the people of the known stations below that of the Perfect Man, from which emanate certain actions which appertain to dispensing and Lordship, although they are not under orders to dispense they begin to dispense by virtue of their qualification by certain Divine Qualities because the remainder of their *nafs* complains. What is meant by 'fire' in their case is the fire of disappointment, because the follower (*sālik*), if he is ever interested in dispensing, he becomes veiled and totally prevented from the witnessing of the beauty of oneness. Where other people of power and branches of importance are meant, in their case the 'fire' means the promised fire. God the High has said: 'The grandeur of the tormentors and the greatness of those who have become depraved and who have contended against Me, for them is entering into the fire.' And God leads whom He wants to the straight path.



The Wisdom of Exaltedness
(*al-ḥikmat al-‘aliyya*)
in the Word of Ishmael

Know that that which is called *Allāh* is Unique by Its Ipseity and Total by Names. Know that in fact the Being which is called *Allāh* is Unique by Its Ipseity and Total by Names, that is to say, because of Its manifesting Itself with the images of the many Names that the image of Divinity contains It is Total, because with the fluency of the *nafs-i-rahmān* the many Divine mutually opposed contradictory Names become manifested.

Now, let it be known like this, that Divinity is a collective degree between the Absolute Ipseity and the Divine Names, and is many and total in consideration of God’s manifesting Himself with the Divine Names. But in consideration of its interior, where its interior is not differentiated from non-particularization (*lā ta‘ayyun*) and Absolute Ipseity except for the particularization itself, it is the same as the Absolute Ipseity. Thus, if the Being which is particularized in that degree, and by which It is called, were related to the Being of the Ipseity, It is equally Unique with the Ipseity and is free of plurality of relationships and being, and all relationships and attributions fall off from It. But if It were related to the images of the Divine Names which are particularized at the degree of Divinity It is the totality of the plurality of all the Divine Names and is manifest with plurality and qualified by it. Hence, for the Ipseity of God, in consideration of Its Oneness, many relationships result, like the relationships of plurality of the one as number – because Divinity necessitates worshippers of Divinity – then the Divinity implies infinitely numerous relationships, just as one intellectually implies halfness, thirdness, quarterness, and other infinite intellectual relationships. Thus, the Unique (*aḥad*) by Its Essence and Ipseity is transcendent from plurality of relationships and being, just as the One (*wāḥid*) is the totality

and the uniqueness of the intellectual plurality, and the totality of the intellectual plurality is the same as Its being and one is the same as the other. Any differentiation between one and the other is only due to its relationship and to its attribution or quality. And all existents have nothing to do with God except by their private Lord. It is impossible that He should be for them the total. For the potentially essential existents there is nothing from God, that is to say, from the degree of Divinity, for each existent except one Name which is its private Lord, and it is beyond possibility for it to be the totality of the Divine Names which is implied in the degree of Divinity. In other words, each of the potential existents, whether it be existence of a kind or existence of a singular person, although it is under the absolute Divine total Lordship, yet there is nothing for it from the degree of Divinity except one Name which educates it privately, and that Name is one special aspect from the many Divine aspects, by which aspect God manifests in it and educates it, and because of that private aspect God becomes its private Lord. Under His Lordship no other Name is associated with it. Consequently, the private Lord of each existent is the revelation and particularization of the Ipseity in consideration of the Name which is private to that existent. Then, that existent is the place of manifestation of that Name and its manifested image, and that Name is its heart and its lip, and it is impossible that by virtue of their totality the totality of the Names which are included in the degree of Divinity appertain to it, that is to say, that the totality of the collectivity of the Divine Names manifests its Lordship over it, and that the Lordship of the collectivity of Divinity be encompassed in it, because the manifestation of the collectivity of the Divine Names is by virtue of the aptitude of the place of manifestation, and nothing other than the Perfect Man has an aptitude to be the place of manifestation for it, because each existent can only be the place of manifestation of one private Name, whether it be total or partial. Consequently, each person is the place of manifestation of God, the Lord of the universes, by virtue of the private Lordship of that private Name from the absolute Lordship. Consequently, that person is like an example for that private Lordship and is like its manifested image, and the servant is the veiling of such a Name.

Consequently, the words: 'And all existents have nothing to do with God except by their private Lord' mean that for each existent, from the Divine Names which imply the degree of Divinity and the Presence of Oneness, there is one private Name by which Name the High God transcends that being, and the connection of that existent to God is through that Name because at the degree of Divinity and in the Presence of Oneness Names are differentiated one from the other. Consequently, as has been mentioned, each existent is the place of manifestation of one private Name from among the Names that the degree of Divinity contains, and is the manifestation of one reality from among the Divine realities at that degree. Thus, each existent's support is that private Name and its own reality. Equally, each existent has no priority in the degree of Divinity. But the Divine Uniqueness is the same as the one, and in copy, what is it to the Unique that it should have priority as It does not say anything from It to the one, or anything to another, because It does not accept division (partitioning)? But the Divine Essential Uniqueness, at which Presence the Divine Names and Lordly realities are in power, is the same as that. Consequently, there is no priority for any one of the existents because the honour is such that it cannot be said that there is anything for one of the Divine Uniqueness, or that for another equally there is something, since that Uniqueness does not accept division. In other words, in the Divine Essential Uniqueness, in which the plurality of relationships of being are collected and are as faculties, all pluralities of relationships and collectivities and beings are according to the quality of Uniqueness. Consequently, in the Presence of Uniqueness the Divine Names are not differentiated one from the other like they are differentiated in the Presence of Oneness, so that there could be a possibility of priority for one person by virtue of that Name and to which he would be attached. Furthermore, the quality of Uniqueness is not receptive of division or partition so that there could be one portion for one person and another portion for another person, so that there could be, by consideration of the portion particular to each person, a priority for him in Uniqueness, and a connection. Consequently, this is impossible because in the Uniqueness there is no being of plurality. The quality of Uniqueness dominates and conquers the

plurality of relationship and existence, because plurality in Uniqueness is only as a faculty and summarized (*ijmāl*) and is the same as the Uniqueness. And His Uniqueness is the total of everything, inherently. This Uniqueness of the Ipseity, which is what is called *Allāh*, is the totality of all the Names, which are inherent in It. In other words, the Uniqueness of the Ipseity is inherently and in strength the totality of all the Names because the Divine Names are in It in strength in summary and are the same as Its Being, and are not differentiated from It, just as the trees with their branches and their leaves and their flowers and their fruit are inherently summarized in the seed, and just as the seed is the inherent strength and collectivity and the totality of all of them, and the same as them, as different from them.

Now let it be known like this, that there are two aspects for that which is called *Allāh*. One is that He is Unique by His Ipseity, that is to say, it is the aspect of the Ipseity of Uniqueness in which are annihilated all relationships and beings of plurality, and the Divine Names which are particularized at the degree of Divinity are there in summary and strength before particularization, and they are the same as It. The other aspect is totality by Names, that is to say, the totality of the plurality of the Names which are individuated in the Divine Presence, which means that He is multiple and total by the aspect of the Names by virtue of His particularization and manifestation in all the Names. Thus, in the Ipseity of Uniqueness the totality of the Divine Names are in strength and in summary and are the same as the Ipseity, and there is no priority for any of the pluralities of Names and beings and the Names of Lordships and all the Lordships from the totality of the Presences of the Divine Names, and in all the Lordships of the totalities of the Names and in all the Lordships of the Names the Ipseity of Uniqueness is detailed, just like in the seed of the tree the branches and the leaves and the flowers and the fruit are detailed. Thus, according to the words: 'What is it to all the existents from God except their private Lord?', there is for each existent a priority and a private Lord in the Uniqueness of Names. When the Shaykh (R.A.) followed the words: 'But the Divine Uniqueness. . . ' by the words: 'What is it to the Unique that it should have priority?', it became known that what was meant by Divine Uniqueness is the

Uniqueness of the Divine Ipseity in which there is no priority for anyone because It is not the Uniqueness of the Divine Names, because in that one (the latter one) all the existents have priority. Under certain considerations, Names (*asmā'*) are the same as the One that is called (*musammā*). The happy is the one who is agreed to by his Lord, except that after that there is not anybody who is not agreed to by his Lord, because it is he who maintains for Him His Lordship, so he is agreed to by Him and he is happy. The Shaykh (R.A.) having spoken before this of the private Lordship and that there was not any existent who did not have his private Lord who educated him, and that it was that portion of that existent from absolute Lordship that educated him by virtue of that existent's established potentiality, which is in fact the revelation of the Absolute Being, and that also it is by virtue of that revelation that it is called by a Name, which preserves and educates that existent through that private Name and that existent is agreed to at the level of his private Lord, he (the Shaykh) proceeds to explain that each one of the existents, by his relationship to his Lord, is happy, and thereby places the matter of happiness under the Wisdom of Ishmael because Ishmael (S.A.) was agreed to at the level of his Lord by Divine absolute stipulation, because of which he was happy. Thus he means that Ishmael was, at the level of his private Lord, agreed to. However, there is not a single person who is not agreed to at the level of his private Lord. His private Lord is that possessor Lord who maintains His Lordship over him. Consequently, that person, at the level of his private Lord, is agreed to, to the extent of his receptivity and ability to receive the Lordship of that Lord, which he maintains over Him. Thus that person is happy. In other words, the happy one is that person who, at the level of his Name which is his private Lord, is agreed to by private aptitude by accepting the Lordship of that private Lord and by that Name's completion becoming manifest by him. Indeed, each existent from among the existences in the Presence of Existence, who is the place of manifestation of the Lordship of that private Lord, is agreed to at that level, because He exercises His Lordship and maintains it over him, and that existent who establishes the Lordship is agreed to at His level. If he was not agreed to He would not maintain His

Lordship over him, This explanation is according to one consideration of grammatical arrangement, but in another way this is to be understood: the one who establishes the Lordship (*marbūb*) is agreed to at the level of his private Lord because that one who establishes the Lordship maintains that Lordship over his private Lord because Lordship depends on the one who establishes the Lordship. It is impossible for it to be realized without the one who establishes Him as Lord. Were the one who establishes it removed, that Lordship, which depends on that one who establishes that Lordship, would have no existence. Thus, that the Lord is qualified by Lordship is due to the one who establishes that Lordship, and the one who establishes the Lordship maintains that private Lordship over his Lord. Consequently, the one who establishes the Lordship is agreed to at the level of his private Lord, because the maintenance of that Lord's quality of Lordship and the maintenance of Lordship over that Lord is by the one who establishes it. Consequently, the one who establishes that Lordship is agreed to at the level of his private Lord and is therefore happy. This is the aspect which is superior, as the Shaykh (R.A.) says: And for this Sahl says: 'Lordship has a mystery, and that is you', and with the word 'you' he addresses all the '*uyūn*. 'If it ceased, the Lordship would have been eliminated', and these words are more suitable and better related to it. That is to say, the Lordship of the Lord depending on the one who establishes the Lordship and consequently because the one who establishes the Lordship maintains the Lordship for the Lord, he is agreed to at His level, and that is why Sahl ibn Abdullah Tostari said: 'In fact there is a mystery for Lordship, and that mystery is yourself.' Sahl, with the word 'you', addresses each '*ayn*. And if that mystery was removed, certainly the Lordship would be eliminated, because Lordship is of the realities of qualification and becomes realized between the Lord and the one who establishes Lordship. If one could conceive the non-existence of one of the two, there would have been no question of Lordship. However, after Lordship having been realized first by one potentiality from among the potentialities, the *ḥaqq* becoming qualified with the quality of Lordship, it becomes primary that in realizing Lordship that it should first depend on the one who establishes Lordship and then

depend on the Lord. Consequently, the maintenance and realization of Lordship has been given over to the one who establishes Lordship. If the one who establishes Lordship is existent and remains (*bāqī*), Lordship equally exists and remains, and if the one who establishes the Lordship disappears, then Lordship also disappears. Consequently, it is apparent from the words of Sahl that there is a mystery of Lordship and that that mystery is your being, and if the mystery of Lordship, which is your potentiality, were to show, that is, were to cease, then the Lordship would also be inexistent. (The word *zahara* which is 'manifest' here means *zāla* which is 'to cease'.) The Shaykh (R.A.) discusses these matters (of the mystery of the Divinity and the mystery of Lordship) in the first volume of the *Futūḥāt*. And he put in there the word '*law*', and that is the word of refusal (*imtinā'*) for impossibility (*imtinā'*). Thus Sahl, God be pleased with him, entered the *law* before the word *zahara*, and *law* is the word of refusal and avoidance as impossibility, which means that if that mystery were manifest or obvious, Lordship would be inexistent. However, it (that is, the mystery) does not manifest and Lordship does not become inexistent. But the fact is that that mystery does not manifest, consequently Lordship does not become inexistent, because it is so, that there is no being for the '*ayn* except by its Lord, and the '*ayn* exists always and Lordship does not disappear ever. The honour is such that for each '*ayn* there is no existence except through the revelation of the Name which is its private Lord, yet the '*ayn* is always existent, consequently Lordship always remains existent because it is Lordship which depends on the existing '*ayn*, and that Lordship never becomes inexistent, nor ceases. What is understood by the Shaykh's last words is this, that the potentiality, which is the mystery of the Lordship on which depends the realization of Lordship, is the existent potentiality which enters into the circle of existence by Lordly revelation, which means that the existent potentialities, which at the level of the First *ta'ayyun*, with the *nafs-i-rahmānī* and Lordly revelations, individuate and are manifest in the mirrors of the established potentialities, enter into the image of the circle of existence and become qualified by being, and thus having become potentialities of being, then, whether they be considered as the potentialities of existence in the higher

mirrors or in the mirrors of the unknowableness or spiritualities, or whether they be considered as the potentialities of sensory beings in the universe of witnessing, they are the potentialities of being, individualized in the First *ta'ayyun*, and having been encircled in all the circles of being, manifest in all the circles of being by the Lordly revelation, and since ever remain. Thus, from the potentialities of being, which are since ever and forever existent by the Lordly revelation, each potentiality is a mystery from among the mysteries of Lordship, and if ever that mystery were to cease, Lordship would become non-existent. However, that mystery never ceases. Consequently, Lordship equally never stops existing. Thus, as the potentiality of being is annihilated and non-existent (*'adam*) in the Ipseity of God, the quality of Lordship, while it was in annihilation in the *ḥaqq*, is manifest and realized by the potentiality of being. The immanential potentialities are without end (infinite). Consequently, Lordship is never cut off. The Shaykh's words: '. . . and the *'ayn* exists always' mean that the receptive potentiality which accepts the Lordly revelation and God's effusion is forever and always existent because by receiving the effusion of the *ḥaqq* it enters the area of being and becomes qualified with being, and that which enters into being never becomes inexistent; whether this be non-manifested in the degrees of being which are the degrees of the unknowable (*ghayb*), whether they are transported into the degrees of *barzakhīyya* or the degrees of the collecting for the Day of Judgement, or regions of the other world or of the paradise, they persist and remain (*bāqī*) forever and for all eternity. All that are agreed to are loved, and all that the one who is loved does is loved, and all of it is agreed to because the potentiality does not do, perhaps rather the doing (belongs) to his Lord, and therein the potentiality is in security from what could be attributed to him (as action), and he agrees to what manifests in him or from him as action from his Lord, because each actor and craftsman is in agreement with his action and his craft. Thus all action is agreed to because there is no action for the existing potentiality. Perhaps rather that all action which manifests in the place of manifestation of that potentiality is established for his private Lord which is revealed in that potentiality. Thus the potentiality is secure from being qualified

with action. Consequently, the potentiality is in agreement to the actions of his private Lord which manifest in him and from him. Such actions are all agreed to because for an actor and a craftsman there is agreement for his actions and craftsmanship, because he has sufficient portion of his actions and his craftsmanship, as He bestowed everything to His creation and then guided, which is that it is clear that He bestowed everything to His creation, and he accepts neither less nor more. In each potential the actor and the craftsman has sufficiently of his own actions and craftsmanship of that portion of action and craftsmanship which was according to his receptivity and which it demanded from the actor and craftsman, and this is understood from the words of God the High which say: 'Gave everything to His creation and then guided.' That is to say, God bestowed upon him his portion which is his creatural nature, that is to say, what his aptitude necessitated, and then guided him. Which means that He makes it clear that He bestowed to everything what its creatural nature demands and that each thing does not accept anything less or more than what his aptitude requires, and demands the portion that his aptitude demands and accepts. The Shaykh (R.A.) gave a clear exegetic explanation of guidance so that it be known and be clear that God the High bestowed on everything its nature and then guided him to everything in accordance with his nature by virtue of his receptivity and aptitude. Consequently, the guided and the person who is agreed at the level of his Lord is that person who knows that God gave everything its nature in accordance with that thing's aptitude.

And it was that Ishmael (S.A.), by discovering this matter we have mentioned, was agreed to, and in the same way all existents are agreed to by their Lord. Thus Ishmael, because he discovered the same matter as that which we have mentioned, became agreed to, that is to say, because Ishmael rose to the knowledge that for the potential action is not established except for the Lord which is revealed and manifest in the potential, and the potential equally does not request from his Lord by his receptivity except that which manifests from Him (his Lord). Thus Ishmael (S.A.) became agreed to by his Lord, and in the same way each existent is agreed to at the level of his private Lord by maintaining the Lordship for that private Lord

by virtue of the fact that in accordance with his aptitude his private Lord reveals Himself to him and manifests His actions in him. It is not necessary, although all existents are agreed to by their Lord as we have explained, that they should be equally agreed to at the level of the Lord of another servant. These words constitute an answer to a possible argument. When the Shaykh (R.A.) said: '. . . and in the same way all existents are agreed to by their Lord', it becomes necessary to argue, for instance, that because the person who is the place of manifestation of the Name Guide (*hādī*) is happy and agreed to at that level, that in the same way the person who is agreed to and happy at the level of the Name Misleader (*muḍill*), who is the place of manifestation of the Name Misleader, should also be absolutely happy and agreed to, because in consideration of this condition it would be necessary that the guided and the misled would be in equality in being agreed to and in being happy, and consequently that the ill-doer would also be necessarily happy. However, this order is not agreed to. Consequently, the Shaykh (R.A.), in answer to this argument, says: if each existent is agreed to at the level of his private Lord, it does not become necessary, as we have explained, that that existent be agreed to at the level of the Lord of another. Because he did not take the Lordship except from all, and not from one, and the individuation did not happen to him from the total except the thing that was suitable, and that (which was individuated) is his (private) Lord. This means that although the portion of each one from the absolute Lordship is individuated and private, yet it does not become individuated and private except by virtue of the particularity of that one. In other words, each one of the existents did not take their Lordship except from the absolute total Lordship, which collects in itself all the Names, but took nothing other than their private Lordship which is suitable and agreeable to their receptivity which is particular to the private Name. Consequently, he is not agreed to at the level of the total absolute Lordship which collects in itself all the Lordships, because, by virtue of his partial receptivity, he only took the private Lordship from the total Lordship. Because he had no total receptivity he did not take total Lordship, and total Lordship did not become realized in him. Consequently, he did not become agreed to at the

level of total Lordship. Therefore it is not necessary that he should be agreed to at the level of another Lord because he is agreed to at the level of his own Lord. Consequently, the Lordship which is individuated from total Lordship and which becomes realized in him is the Lordship which is suitable to him, that is to say, what his receptivity demanded and which is the Lordship particular to that private Name. Consequently, the private Name which is the owner of a private Lordship is only agreed to at the level of that private Name which is his private Lord, and is not agreed to at the level of the other Lordships which comprise total Lordship, because he did not accept their Lordship, and their Lordship is not individuated in him. The Shaykh (R.A.) says: 'Because he did not take the Lordship except from all, and not from one', because if each one of the existents had not taken the private Lordship from the total Lordship but had taken it only from the private Lord, then the one who is agreed to at the level of one Lord would necessarily be agreed to at the level of another Lord. For instance, it would be necessary in cases like *ra'ūf* and *'aṭūf* and *rahīm* which are related Names, that the person in whom is realized the establishment of Lordship of the Lordship of *ra'ūf*, and who has established the Lordship at that level and is agreed to, would necessarily be also agreed to at the level of *'aṭūf* which is another Lord; and in the same way in the case of the opposing Names like *jalīl* and *jamīl* where some of the establishments of Lordships which are agreed to at the level of *jalīl* are equally agreed to at the level of *jamīl*, as *jamāl* manifests in the *jalāl*, and *jalāl* manifests in the *jamāl*, as His *jamāl* results in His *jalāl*, and His *jalāl* necessitates His *jamāl*; thus it becomes necessary that the one who establishes Lordship who is agreed to at the level of one Lord, is also agreed to at the level of another Lord. In the same way, according to the belief of Ibn Qasiy, which is that whichever Name you take from among the Divine Names it becomes the Greatest Name (*ism-i-a'zam*) as it leads to the Name of the Ipseity and the Ipseity collects in Itself the totality of the Divine Names, consequently that each of the existents leads to the Ipseity, and consequently that if he is agreed to at the level of his private Lord he is necessarily also agreed to at the level of the Ipseity, and he who is agreed to at the level of the Ipseity is necessarily agreed to at the

level of the totality of the Lordly Names. This is why the Shaykh said as he did: '. . . not from one', according to which aspect: because every existent takes from total Lordship and his private Lord agrees with him; it does not necessarily follow that he should be agreed to at the level of another Lord. Consequently, if the arguer argues with the Shaykh (R.A.) and says: 'There is no doubt that the words: "It is not necessary, although all existents are agreed to by their Lord as we have explained, that they should be equally agreed to at the level of the Lord of another servant" do not necessitate the words: "Because he did not take the Lordship except from all, and not from one" which are the invalidation of it. Rather perhaps the opposite, that is to say: "Because he did not take the Lordship except from one, and not from all" would be necessitated, because each existent, taking from one and becoming agreed to at that level, is not necessarily agreed to at the level of another Lord. On the other hand, the one who takes from all and is agreed to at the level of one would necessarily be agreed to at the level of the other. Yet what you said is the opposite of this, and what you have declared would be expelled as we have verified by our argument.' The Shaykh Mu'ayyad Jundi verifies like this at this place: 'The portion of each one from absolute Lordship, although individuated and private, did not, however, become an individuated and particularized portion except by virtue of the particularity of that one person.' The particularity of his receptivity from the absolute Lordship became suitable to that thing which his receptivity necessitated. Consequently, Lord and the establisher of Lordship, each of these becomes satisfied with his owner due to his relationship to that, and this does not necessitate that the particular Lordship be related to the particularity of another potential. This never happens, because some of the particularities are differentiated from the others by the fact that there is established differentiation and severance between one particularity and the other. Consequently, there never is association in particularities where the potentialities are concerned. Each potentiality becomes agreed to at the level of its private Lord. Consequently, if one potentiality had taken its Lordship from one individuation, and equally another potentiality had taken it from that same, the private individuated Lordship would be

in association. However, private Lordship is never in association. Consequently, no potentiality took from the total if it were not in him effectively in collectivity in himself. And like this Al-Qashani also says that each potentiality from among the potentialities takes from the absolute Lordship that Lordship which is particular to that Name which is suitable to itself and does not take from one thing. That is to say, the totality of the potentialities do not take it from a specific one so that it would be necessary that if the one is agreed to at the level of his private Lord he would be agreed to equally at the level of another Lord. The Absolute Lord is Lord of Lords. All the superior commentators, each one of them takes the Shaykh's words: '... not from one' to mean this, that all the potentialities did not take the Lordship from the 'Leaders' (meaning Names) which is a definite one, so that one servant who is agreed to at the level of his Lord be equally agreed to at the level of the Lord of another servant, both their Lords being the same. But what the Shaykh (R.A.) aims at in the words: 'It is not necessary, although all existents . . . etc.', and in the words: 'All existents are agreed to by their Lord', and before that in his words: 'The happy is the one who is agreed to by his Lord', is that even though each one of the existents is agreed to at the level of his Lord and is happy, he (the Shaykh) wishes to remove the equality, which is in every way conjectured in the relative, in happiness and agreement among the existents, and to establish the difference of agreement in relation to the Lords of such people as the complete ones, and the lacking ones, and the happy ones, and the corrupt ones (ill-doers), and the believers, and the deniers (coverers-up), and the ones who are obedient, and the ones who revolt, and to explain that the one who is agreed to at the level of the Lord of the Misleader is not the same as the one who is agreed to at the level of the Guide. For instance, it does not mean that for any person who is at a level corresponding to the degree of Ishmael and who is agreed to at the level of his private Lord, that it is necessary that he should also be agreed to at the level of the private Lord of Ishmael. Consequently, like this, agreement is a relative order and not absolute, and in the same way it does not result in the order of eternal felicity. That which causes eternal felicity is to be agreed to at the level of the total absolute Lordship with the order of

being the total place of manifestation. Thus, among the existents, while each one is agreed to at the level of his private Lord, as he is not agreed to at the level of another Lord, he remains among the existents.

Because the superior ones and the complete ones and those mentioned have said that in the words of the Shaykh (R.A.): ‘. . . not from one’ (that the totality of existents did not take from one particular so that it be necessary that if one is agreed to at the level of one private Lord that he should also be agreed to at the level of another Lord) it is not necessary that it should be understood that it would not be necessary that even if the totality of existents take it from a definite Lord and one person is agreed to at the level of one Lord, that he should also be agreed to at the level of another Lord although it is still his own Lord and that this would lead to eternal happiness and result in perfection and completion. Were this so it would be necessary that they all take from one and the same Lord, and the Lordship of the Lords of the other Names would remain unattended and not one of the existents would be acceptable at the level of another Lord, and the totality of completion would never happen for such a person, and in this way all the existents taking from one individuation, and when one such becomes agreed to at the level of his Lord, for him to be agreed to at the level of the Lord of another, which is still his own Lord, would be harvesting the harvest since all their Lords would be one. Thus, it would come to mean that one existent, being agreed to at the level of his Lord, is agreed to at the level of his Lord. It becomes very evident and definite from the words: ‘. . . not from one’ that what it is intended to mean is that as all the existents take from one definite, that if one becomes agreed to at the level of his Lord it is not necessary for him to be agreed to at the level of the Lord of another, even though that Lord is also his own Lord. In fact rather that this is an impossible order because it is conditioning to an impossible because all the existents do not take Lordship from one. Perhaps rather what is meant by one is, according to the usual aspect of understanding, that each one of the Names, which are different Lords, is from which all (total of different Names) each one of the existents takes. If you cut your vision from all, due to the factor of

individuated Lordship, again it does not take from one definite. When David of Caesarea takes the words: 'Because he did not take the Lordship except from all, and not from one, and the individuation did not happen to him from the total except the thing that was suitable, and that is his (private) Lord' as an invalidation (*ta'ill*) for the words: 'And it was that Ishmael (S.A.), by discovering this matter we have mentioned, was agreed to . . .' he refers the pronoun 'because he' to Ishmael himself, and the resultant lack of hitting the mark is understandable by the person who has a low degree of comprehension.

And no one takes it from God by virtue of His Uniqueness, and because of this the people of God have forbidden revelation in Uniqueness. These words are answer to a possible objection which might be that if Lordship is taken from Uniqueness it is necessary then that he who is agreed to at the level of one Lord should also be agreed to at the level of another Lord, since Uniqueness is the origin and collectivity of all Lordships. The answer is that he says: there is not one who takes Lordship by virtue of God's Uniqueness, because in the Uniqueness there is no severalness or being part. It is because of this that the people of God forbid the revelation in the Uniqueness, because for revelation it is necessary to have the one revealed to and the one who reveals, and these negate the Uniqueness since it needs severalness and multiplicity. Consequently, the revelation that happens in the Uniqueness is the same as the Uniqueness Itself. He reveals His Being to His own Self, and revelation, the revealed and the revealed to are all One Being. And if you were to look at Him by Him, He is the one who looks to His own Self. The One who looks does not disappear from looking at Himself by Himself. Thus, if you were to look at the *haqq* with the Being of the *haqq*, that is to say, you would be looking at Him with the Being of the *haqq* after you have been the total place of manifestation of the *haqq* and that the *haqq* has manifested in you with the totality of manifestation of His Ipseity and Quality. Thus, the *haqq* looks at His own Self. Thus, the *haqq* does not disappear from looking at Himself by Himself. Thus, in Uniqueness the looker and the one who is looked at is the One Being of God. There is no other thing in that which could look at Him or take from Him. Consequently, one cannot take from Him by virtue

of His Uniqueness. If you were to look at Him by you, the Uniqueness disappears by you (by your being), and if you look at Him by Him and by you the Uniqueness disappears equally, because the pronoun *tā'* (that is. the pronoun which makes it second person) in the words 'you look at' is not the same as what is seen. Without a doubt the Uniqueness disappears because of the existence of a relationship which is necessitated by the two orders of the one who looks and the one who is looked at. And if you were to look at the *ḥaqq* with your relative being, then, by your being, the Uniqueness disappears, because with the word 'by you' there is established for you a being and the view is attributed to that. Thus, duality results. And if you look at the *ḥaqq* with His Being and your being, that is to say, when your eye has been qualified with the Divine Quality, then you would be looking with the remainder of your being and with the eye of the Qualities of the *ḥaqq* which is as in the closeness of supererogatories where the *ḥaqq* is the eye of the servant and looks with that. Thus again, like before, the Uniqueness disappears, because the pronoun *tā'* in the words 'you look at Him' is not the same as that which is looked at; because the *tā'* is conditioned by the words 'by Him and by you', as in addressing somebody, the looking cannot be attributed only to God so that the one who looks and the one who is looked at are both the *ḥaqq*. Perhaps rather that the one who looks is the *khalq*, the Being of the *ḥaqq*, and the one looked at is the *ḥaqq*. Because of the existence of this sort of relationship it is impossible that it should not necessitate and create two orders which are the looker and the one who is looked at, and establishes a relationship in the act of looking in the association of the *ḥaqq* and the *khalq*, and where it concerns being looked at, it is the singularization of the *ḥaqq*. Consequently, there is established a differentiation between the one who looks and the one who is looked at, and Uniqueness disappears. And in fact it is absolutely so that He did not see except Himself by Himself, and it is known that He is in this quality the one who looks and the one who is looked at. This means that if God looked by His own Being through the place of manifestation of the addressee, at the same time as looking by the being of the addressee, that He saw no other than Himself by Himself, it is known that in this quality, that is to say, by the being

of the addressee and with His own Being, the *ḥaqq* is the one who looks and the one who is looked at. However, as it is in negation of the Uniqueness of the Ipseity this relationship is impossible, and to look at this relationship is the association of the addressee to the *ḥaqq*, which means that the *ḥaqq* and the *khalq* are the ones who look, and the *ḥaqq* is the one that is seen. Thus *ḥaqq* is both the one who looks and the one who is seen. But this creates a flaw in the Uniqueness by the existence of the relationship. It is also possible that the meaning is as follows: even if the *ḥaqq* saw no other than His own Self by His own Self from the place of manifestation of the addressee, since for the essence of the possible, by virtue of its non-existence (*'adam*), looking is not established, looking, then, again appertains to the *ḥaqq* who is manifest in the essence of the possible, and it is known that the *ḥaqq* in this qualification, that is to say, when He is qualified by manifesting in the place of manifestation of the essence of the possible, is both the one who looks and the one who is looked at. Thus, even under this consideration the Uniqueness disappears because of the aspect of the look manifesting in the place of manifestation of the essence of the possible.

It is not true that the one agreed to is agreed to absolutely. When it is established that each existent did not take the Lordship except from the all, that is to say, from the absolute Lordship, and only took from it the thing that is suitable from the private Lordship, then according to this consideration it is established that it is not true for the existent who is agreed to at the level of the private Lord to be absolutely agreed to, which means that it would not be true that he would be agreed to at the level of the totality of the Lordships of the Divine Names which is implied by the absolute total Lordship, because as each one of the existents takes from the private Lordship that which is suitable by virtue of the width of his receptivity from the total Lordship, that he is agreed to at the level of the private Name which is the possessor of that Lordship which is his private Lord, does not necessitate that he should be also agreed to at the level of another Lord. Consequently, for the one who is agreed to at the level of his private Lord it is not necessarily true that he should be absolutely agreed to, because the fact that he is agreed to at the level of his

private Lord does not necessitate that he should be agreed to at the level of another Lord. Unless all that manifests in him is the action through him of the one who agrees. Unless all the actions, states, characters, effects, that are manifested with the one who is agreed to, in the one who is agreed to, are of the action of the one who agrees. That is to say, for no one is individuated (anything) from total Lordship except the private Lordship which is suitable to him. Thus that man's actions are agreed to at the level of his private Lord but not at the level of the Absolute Lord, because it is not true that one can be the absolute agreed to unless all the actions are the actions of the one who agrees and manifests in the one agreed to. Consequently, one can only be agreed to absolutely when action is the action of the one who agrees, because the *haqq* agrees absolutely to His own action. It is in consideration of this that absoluteness comes only from the action of the one who agrees. Another aspect is as follows: when a person takes from total Lordship that which is suitable to him he is agreed to at the level of his private Lord, and it is not true that he can be absolutely agreed to, unless, of course, all the actions and effects that manifest from that one are of the action of the one who agrees. The action of the one who agrees manifests in completion and perfection in the Perfect Man when he collects the receptivities of total Lordship and is the total place of manifestation with total receptivity. The High said: 'It is our Lord who bestowed everything upon His creation', and said: 'And indeed, all ends in your Lord.' Consequently, it is his action which becomes absolutely agreed to at the level of the Absolute Lord, which is the Lord of the Lords, and what He is absolutely agreed to is from the side of the Perfect Man, because as the total Lordship manifests in him and he is realized by it the Absolute Lord is pleased with him because he maintains the absolute Lordship over Him, and at the level of the Absolute Lord his actions are absolutely agreed to.

And Ishmael became superior to others of the essences by that which the *haqq* gave him as praise that he was with his Lord agreed to. That is to say, when each one of the essences of the essences of being were agreed to at the level of their private Lord, Ishmael (S.A.) became superior to other essences than himself because God the High praised him with being agreed to at the level of his Lord: 'And he

was with his Lord agreed to.' These words are very clear, and by qualifying this the High God made him superior to the other essences. Consequently, his superiority over other essences is due to the fact that God clearly specified that he was at the level of his Lord agreed to, and mentioned in the Book: 'Ishmael, he was faithful of promise and he was envoy prophet, and he used to order his people with *ṣalāt*, *ṣalawāt* and *zakāt*, and he was with his Lord agreed to.' The Shaykh (R.A.) has mentioned already that Ishmael was agreed to, prior to this, where he says: 'And it was that Ishmael (S.A.), by discovering . . . etc.', whereby he showed clearly that what the *ḥaqq* bestows upon each thing is its creatural nature, in other words, that which he demanded from the *ḥaqq* according to his receptivity, and that is his portion, and it is because of his attaining to the fact that this is his portion and that this attainment is the knowledge of the Mystery of *qadā'* and *qadar* which is the beginnings of *tawḥīd*. Consequently, his envoyship and his prophethood aside, it is because of his reaching to the knowledge of *tawḥīd* that Ishmael (S.A.) was true to his promise. This means that the High God takes from all prophets the dire covenant which is the covenant of *tawḥīd*, which means that they may not pray to or face anything other than the *ḥaqq* and that they do not prove existence for anything other than the *ḥaqq*, and after this promise and commitment of and to *tawḥīd*, because Ishmael (S.A.) was established upon that commitment and all his actions were according to *tawḥīd* and his *tawḥīd* governed all his states, God made him thanked and praised by the words: 'He was true of promise.' Because he established the Being of the *ḥaqq* by negating anything other than the *ḥaqq*, and because he ordered witnessing and prayer to the *ḥaqq* according to meditation and presence which necessarily invites *tawḥīd* to all his intimates in the horizons that obeyed him and to all his intimates in his own *nafs* which are his spiritual powers and powers of his *nafs*, and to his spirit and to his heart and to his *nafs*, and again, because he ordered that they should banish all that is other than the *ḥaqq* from their being, and kill their *nafs* with the sword of love of God and by cleaning and purifying it (their *nafs*) of uncleanness of emanations and of being two, he was praised and mentioned by the words: 'He used to order his intimates with *ṣalawāt* and *zakāt*.'

Consequently, because of his attainment to the knowledge of *tawhīd*, being faithful of promise in the commitment to *tawhīd*, and because he ordered and showed the value of *tawhīd*, he became agreed to at the level of his Lord, and also, with the words: 'He was with his Lord agreed to', became praised. Because he was qualified with absolute servanthood and because he did not rise to dispensing (*taṣarruf*) and Lordship, and because all actions that emanated from him were the actions of the one who agrees, he and his actions became at the level of the Absolute Lord absolutely agreed to. And it is in this same way that all confident *nafs* are told: 'Return to your Lord.' And each confident *nafs* who has been told to return to his Lord is agreed to like Ishmael. That is to say, each *nafs* who is confident with his Lord and has abandoned the ephemeral tastes because of his observing the ever-remaining Beauty is he who agrees and he who is agreed to, and being agreed to he became the place of manifestation of the address: 'Return to your Lord.' Could there be a greater (grander) agreement than this from Lord to His servant than where God invites him to Himself and exposes His Beauty to him?

Nevertheless, that each confident *nafs* is agreed to is (because he is) at the level of his private Lord agreed to. From one aspect Ishmael is a relative agreed to by the fact of being agreed to at the level of his private Lord. But in two aspects he is absolutely agreed to. One aspect is due to this, that Ishmael (S.A.) is a Perfect Man and is in the place of manifestation of all Lordships which the absolute Lordship implies and by the fact that absolute Lordship is realized by him, and the other aspect is this, that he is by virtue of his qualification with absolute servanthood and because all actions manifesting from him are the actions of God who agrees. What is meant by the confident *nafs* is the human spirit. And He ordered him (the confident heart – *nafs-i-muṭma'inna*) to return to his Lord who had invited him. Thus the High God did not order the confident heart to return except to his private Lord who invites him from collectivity of total Lordship so that he becomes a place of revelation and a place of manifestation for the lights of His perfections, and a place and source of origin for His rulership of Lordship, which he knew from among all, as agreeing. Thus the *nafs* equally having differentiated his Lord who invited and

is invited from the Lords of other Names, knew Him to be agreeing and that he was being separated and distinguished from other servants and was being invited to Him, being agreed to; thus he responds to the invitation of the *haqq* and concords with His order. (And says to them): 'And enter into (the category) of My servants', as this station (of agreeing) is their possession, and the servants mentioned here are all servants who know their Lord, who are contented with Him and do not look at another Lord, as the essences of all the Lords are according to Uniqueness and as the One Essence has collected the totality of Lords. That is to say, in the words 'My servants' the servants mentioned are all servants who have known their own Lord and who are contented with it and do not look at any other Lord, since the essences of all the Lords are according to the Uniqueness and since One 'ayn collects the totality of Lords. 'And enter My paradise' which is with which I cover Myself (the word 'janna' – 'paradise' – is of the same root as 'jinn', and that means 'covering'), and what is My paradise other than you, and it is you by your self that covers Me. In certain copies it reads: which is My mystery, which means, it is My veiling. Thus, enter My paradise, but it is that My paradise, Oh self, is no other than you because you cover Me by your ipseity (*dhāt*) and you are My veil. He who enters you reaches Me, and nothing other than Me is found in you. Which means that when the servant is agreed to at the level of his Lord and joins his Lord as being His place of manifestation whereby all His actions manifest in him, to which manifestation the Lord agrees, thus the servant becomes the paradise of the Lord because the Lord is manifested by the servant and is covered in his being the place of manifestation, and in this way the servant made of his *nafs* the protection for his Lord and covers Him from blameworthy actions. Thus the servant attributes to himself all blameworthiness even though by origin all action is the Lord's: 'Say: All is from God.' He also made of his Lord a protection and a cover for his own *nafs* in all renderings of grace and perfection. Thus, he qualified his Lord with all grace, and the servant became covered and veiled by the being of the Lord because of the attribution of all grace to Him. Consequently, in rendering of grace the Lord became the cover for the servant, and in blameworthy things the

servant became the cover for the Lord. But, nevertheless, the servant does not become existent except through the existence of the Lord, and in the same way the Lord equally is not manifested or individuated except by manifesting in the place of manifestation of the servant. Thus the Lord is manifested in the place of manifestation of the servant, and the servant by his being is the cover for his Lord. Consequently, there is no cover for the Lord like the self of the servant, whether it is considered from the point of view that the *nafs* of the servant is protection for his Lord in attribution of blames, or whether it be in consideration of the Lord's manifestation and individuation by the being of the servant and that He veils Himself by it and covers Himself by it. I am not known except by you, just as you are not except by Me, and if someone knows you he knows Me, and I am not known and you cannot be known, which means that I am not known by My Ipseity and you cannot be known by your reality, which means that the being of the Perfect Man is the total place of manifestation for the Being of God. God is manifested in him with the image of total Divine Ipseity. 'He who sees me has indeed seen God', 'He who obeys the Envoy indeed obeys God.' Thus the High God says: My Being, which is the Absolute Being, is unknowable except in your place of manifestation and by My presence and manifestation and revelation in your mirroriness lifting away the veil of multiplicity from the face of Uniqueness, just as you are not qualified by being except by My revelation and manifestation of the Light of My Being in your established potentiality which is inexistent. Consequently, your being is My Being. I am known and recognized with your place of manifestation, just as you are manifest and existent by My Being. Consequently, in knowledge you are the origin and I am the bough, and in being I am the origin and you are the bough. As the Shaykh says in his book called 'The Book of Witnessings': 'You are the original (*aşl*) and I am the bough, and I am the original and you are the bough.' Consequently, he who knows you by virtue of My manifestation in you, knows Me, because your being is according to non-being. What is manifest in your being is My Being. Thus, he who knows you knows Me by virtue of Me manifesting in you, and he who witnesses you witnesses Me. By virtue of My Absolute Ipseity

I am not known, because God, due to His Essential Absoluteness, is neither qualified, nor praised, nor known, nor witnessed. Equally, you cannot be known by virtue of your reality because your reality is summarized in My Ipseity. Rather perhaps that it is therein annihilated and is according to non-being. Consequently, if My Ipseity is unknown it is evident that your reality cannot be known. Thus, God becomes both known and unknown. That He is known is subject to the fact that the servant is known, and that the servant is unknown is subject to God being unknown. Consequently, the servant is also both known and unknown. As the Shaykh (R.A.) says:

And if one did not know of a thing its reality,
How then can He be known and be related to within
him?

And if you have entered His paradise you have entered your *nafs*. The Shaykh (R.A.) says, if you have entered His paradise you enter your own *nafs* because your *nafs* is His paradise. He is veiled by your *nafs* and He is manifested by your *nafs*. Whenever a Lord from among the Lords of the Divine Names calls to His servant: 'Return to your Lord', and orders him to enter the paradise of his Lord, the gnostic enters his own self because the gnostic has gnosis of the fact that the paradise of his private Lord is his own *nafs*. The gnostic servant has gnosis of the fact that he is for that Lord the place of manifestation, the place of revelation and the extended throne, and that the Lord is Lord and Master. The Lord never desists from being the lover of His servant and from showing agreement to him and being agreeable to him, and equally, the servant never fails to be in gnosis of his Lord and to be in His paradise and to be agreed to at His level. God be pleased with them and show them His agreement.

And He never stops agreeing to us with all His Love,
And His passion never fades from being all-loving
affection,
He forbids me separation from Him and necessitates
My joining Him without possibility of distance or
closeness.

The Shaykh's words come to address you to explain the words of the Lord, but while doing so there appears a subtle premonition of Union, and this is the subtlety: while in these words the Lord is addressing the *nafs*, there appears an address to the *nafs* from the place of manifestation of the Shaykh, because in these words both the letter *tā'* and *kāf* are according to the diacritical open sound. However, if one wants to take them with the diacritical being the *kasra*, which is also allowable, it becomes only the Lord's address to the *nafs* and becomes the completion of the past words. Nevertheless, the most suitable aspect is not this but the one mentioned just before. And you will have gnosis of your *nafs* with further gnosis other than the gnosis by which you were gnostic of it when you were gnostic of your Lord by your own gnosis, which means, you will know your *nafs* with a further knowledge other than the knowledge of the *nafs* which caused you to know your Lord before this, and that knowledge is this: you will know your *nafs* by virtue of the knowledge of your Lord, because the original knowledge you had of your *nafs*, by which knowledge you came to know your Lord, showed you that your lacks and blames were from your own *nafs*, and perfections and praises from your Lord. Consequently, you made of your *nafs* a paradise for your Lord and covered Him and attributed to Him all perfections and praise, and in that knowledge you knew the Lord by the knowledge of your *nafs*. That is to say, you knew your Lord by virtue of your own *nafs*, not by virtue of your Lord. In this other knowledge you know your *nafs* through the knowledge of your Lord. That is to say, you will know your *nafs* by virtue of your Lord, not by virtue of your *nafs*, and in this knowledge you will know that you are the place of manifestation of God, and the action which exists in you is His action. Consequently, in this knowledge of witnessing you will attribute to yourself all the perfections which you attributed to your Lord in the unknowable gnosis, because all the perfections in you are God's actions and your being is His Being, and you attribute no action to the place of manifestation. And you will be possessor of two gnosises, a gnosis of Him by virtue of you, and a gnosis of Him by you, due to Him, not due to you. This means that of these two knowledges which you now possess the first is the knowledge of your Lord due to your

nafs, that is to say, by virtue of your *nafs* that you came to know Him and due to the determinations of possibilities which are necessary for it. And the other is the knowledge of the Lord by virtue of the knowledge of the *nafs*, again, by virtue of the Lord, not by virtue of the *nafs*, which means, the knowledge of the *nafs* because your *nafs* is the being of the Lord, and the knowledge of the *nafs* is not through and due to the *nafs*. Another way to understand is: your knowledge of the Lord due to the fact that you are the place of manifestation, not because of you.

And you are the servant and you are the Lord,
Since you are to Him and in Him the servant.

Thus, in consideration of the first gnosis you are servant for the Lord whose dominion is manifested in you, and for the Name whose determination is over you, whom you know by His qualifications of action and His Essential Richness beyond Need from the actions through your own *nafs* and its essential inability and dependence. In consideration of the second gnosis, for that private Lord, because of His manifestation in you, you are the servant in Him, and because of His agreeing to all you ask of Him which happens in the images of order your dominion over Him is manifest, and equally, at the level of His Lordship He is realized by you and because you maintain the Lordship of the Lord over Him. Consequently the consideration becomes like this: and you are the Lord to the private Lord in which you are, which means the determination of His Lordship to His servant.

Now let it be known like this, that God the High is manifest and hidden, and by the Name Manifest (*zāhir*) there is Lordship established for the Name Hidden (*bā'in*). Nevertheless, the hidden educates the manifest by effusing the lights of the Unknowable over the manifest and by manifesting the determinations and the effects of the unknowable Divine Names. In the same way, the manifest educates the hidden and makes it reach completion by receiving as effusions the lights of the interior and by the fact that the manifestation in the exterior of the determinations of the Names is by the place of manifestation of the Name Manifest, which, if one disregards their manifestation in the manifest, remain in lack in the interior, or even

perhaps in non-existence. Consequently, the education of the interior is manifestation, help and effusing, and the education of the manifest is to make manifest and to receive and to be effused upon and to bring about completion in the degree of completion. Consequently, for both of these Names mentioned, there is for each one of them Lordship and servanthood, but there is not one existent in being other than the Presence of Divinity which is qualified with absolute Lordship because of His Necessarily-so-ness and because of His Richness beyond Need with His Ipseity from the universes.

And you are the Lord and you are the servant,
Since to Him in the address there is a covenant.

That is, in the same way, you are again the Lord and the servant for that Lord for whom there is established a covenant at the time of the address: '*alastu*', which means that for you and in you there is manifested both Lordship and servanthood for your Lord who addressed you with the address: 'Am I not your Lord?' (*alastu bi-rabbikum*), where, in that covenant and enactment of promise, He addressed you with the expression of Lordship and you promised by agreeing to His Lordship with the word '*balā*', and you covenanted with Him and you manifested with servanthood, consequently you are a servant for Him, but because His Lordship became realized by you and you maintained His Lordship over Him and you determined over Him with Lordship, you are manifested with Lordship. Consequently, you are with Him Lord. However, let it be known that the Lordship and servanthood in this couplet is a degree from among the degrees of the Unknowableness and spirituality, and the Lordship and servanthood in the former couplet is in the universe of collectivity and being and in the degree of manifestation and witnessing.

And for each act of promise for which there is a
person,
There is another promise which dissolves it.

This means that for each promise upon which a person from the people is established, and that promise is that covenant which has happened between him and his private Lord, there is another promise

than that promise which he has with his private Lord which dissolves his promise, for instance, the servant of the Merciful whose determination is in opposition to the servant of the Destroyer and dissolves the former's promise. And this word "aqd", 'promise', can also be 'aqīda which means 'belief', in which case: from the Lordships of the Divine Names one person is the place of manifestation for one Name and that person is in accordance with a private belief which is of the necessity of the determinations of that Name, by which he is distinguished from the other Lords of belief, just as the Name which is his private Lord is distinguished from other Names by a private particularity. Thus, each belief upon which a person is established by the necessities of the private Lord which is manifest in him, that belief is dissolved by that other person for whom there is a belief which is other than that belief according to the determinations of the Lord which is particular to it. Thus, the servant of the Subtle (*laṣīf*) is according to a belief which the servant of the Destroyer (*qahhār*) dissolves, because this one's belief is in opposition to the other one's. Equally, the servant of the Manifest is according to a belief which the servant of the Interior will dissolve since this one's belief is in opposition to the other. Consequently, each Name has a private Lordship which is in opposition to the Lordship of another Name. Each person is upon a private belief and a private action, which, at the level of his private Lord, is agreed to, and at the level of the Lord of another servant it is not agreed to, and each Name only agrees to the servant who establishes Him as the Lord (*marbūb*). In this context the word 'man' (in the last verse of the poem above) is a noun which is the actor of the word 'dissolves it' (*yaḥulluhu*), or it could also be with the diacritical sign *kasra*, to read 'min', in which case the actor of 'dissolves it' is the word 'the belief', for instance: dissolves the belief which happens to it from other. And God agrees to His servants and they are agreed to, and they agree to Him, all of them, and He is agreed to. Thus, God, who is individuated in the degree of Divinity which includes all the Divine Names, agrees to all His servants because each of the Lordships of the Divine Names which are in the degree of Divinity agrees to its servant by manifesting in him and by him the effects which are the necessities of its wisdom. Consequently, the

Name God (*Allāh*), by virtue of the fact that it contains the collectivity of the Names, agrees to the servants of these Names because it manifests by them the Names of determinations and effects. Thus, the servants of God (*Allāh*) who are the places of manifestation of the Lordships of the totality of the Divine Names are agreed to at the level of God (*Allāh*), and they in turn agree to Him because He has bestowed upon them being in their 'ayn which they have demanded, and also because He has extended to them and effused upon them their portion which the receptivity of each one required, having manifested their perfections which were hidden in the treasuries of the Names. Thus, at their level God is agreed to. However, in the words: 'And He does not agree to covering up the Truth in His servants', the non-agreement of God the High to covering up and aggression is due to it being an order of proposition because He proposed to His servants belief and obedience. Consequently, God has no agreement to aggression and to covering up the Truth. On the other hand, His agreement results by virtue of Divine Will because their actions are in accordance to His Will and no action emanates from them except that action which God's (the *ḥaqq's*) Will has made to appertain to their chests (hearts, interiors).

The two Presences became contrary to each other, as things which are alike are contrary to each other, and things which are alike are in opposition to each other because things which are alike do not add up to one, because had they (added together) they would not be differentiated from each other, and after all that, what there is is only that which is differentiated one from the other. Thus, the two Presences, that is, the Presence of Lordship which unites and collects together all the Lords, and the Presence of servanthood which collects together and unites all the servants, are contrary. The contraries are like things alike, because, of the two Presences, each one is agreed to at the level of the other Presence and agrees to it. Thus, in each being agreeable and agreed to and in each one of them manifesting its determinations in the other, they are like things which are alike, but things which are alike are in opposition to each other in that things that are like each other do not unite together because were they to be united they would not be distinguishable from each other, but the fact

is that there is nothing in being that is not distinguished from another because in the Divine Presence the Names are distinguished one from the other. Thus, these things which are alike do not unite together, and if they cannot unite they are in opposition to each other. That is why the two Presences are contrary, just like the contrariety of the things which are alike and in opposition. However, the Shaykh (R.A.), having established the being of opposites and likes in the explanation of the two Presences, proceeds to explain in consideration of the Reality of Being which unites the two Presences which are in fact one reality, by pointing to that One Reality which removes likeness and opposition, and thereby goes on to explain the oneness of Ipseity, and after that the oneness of the width and latitude of being, and says: **And after that there is no like; and there is in being no alike and there is in being no opposite, because in fact being is One Reality and a thing is not in opposition to its own self, which means that there is no consideration of being alike in the Reality of Oneness because It is in accordance with the quality of Uniqueness. Consequently, there is no 'alike' in being and no opposition in being, because being is One Reality and a thing can never be in opposition to its own self and essence, which means that the Ipseity of Uniqueness, which is One Reality, is established in accordance with the quality of Uniqueness wherein there is no differentiation or plurality which could be alike to It. Consequently, in the Reality of Being, which is Its exterior and which collects together the Presence of Lordship and the Presence of servanthood, there is equally no 'alike' because the One Reality, which is according to the Uniqueness of the Ipseity, is manifested in the mirrors of being according to oneness. Consequently, there can be no 'alike' in being, and consequently there can be no opposition in being, since being is One Reality, and it is impossible that one thing be multiple in itself and be alike to and in opposition to its own self, because that One Reality is individuated only intellectually in the degrees of distinguishing. Consequently, the manifest is the same as the place of manifestation, and the place of manifestation is the same as the manifest, and individuations and particularizations are the qualities and modes of that One Reality. The Essence or Self is One. However, in the Presence of Being there is nothing which is**

not distinguishable one from the other. Consequently, 'by being distinguishable it is necessary that it becomes in opposition or alike, and the two Presences are contraries like things alike. Consequently, the two Presences became in opposition like the opposition of things alike, in the same way as a thing is distinguishable which is in the Presence of Being. That is why non-existence of 'alike' is necessary because it distinguishes from another. For each thing that is distinguishable there is no 'like' because it is different and in opposition. Consequently, what he says in his words: '. . . only that which is differentiated' resulting in the two lacks, that is to say, the like and non-existence of like, he said: 'And after that there is no like', which means that if a thing is distinguished outside the Presence of Being, then there can be no 'alike' in the exterior because that which is in the exterior is distinguishable and each distinguishable is in opposition, consequently there can be no 'alike' in it. Hence, like what he said above, there is no 'alike' in being. Consequently, there is no opposition in being because being is One Reality and a thing is not in opposition to its own self. Consequently, when the things are distinguishable one from the other which are individuated in the Being, then no matter from which aspect, there can be no 'like'. Thus, in Reality it is as if not one person remains in being, which means generality does not remain due to its passing away in the *haqq*, because the universe necessitates plurality, but with the manifestation of the Reality of Oneness plurality is annihilated. Thus, in Reality there is no to which another is united because there is no arriving. Equally in that Reality there is nothing which separates, that is to say, which discriminates, because there is no particularized thing from which it could be distinguishable or particularized because the plurality of relativity and of being is annihilated in the Reality of Oneness whereas separation and arriving are orders of relativity, and there does not come about except between two and it becomes evident that in Reality there is no twoness. Insight gave with naked evident proof of the thing (which is mentioned) that when I look and witness with my eye I see nothing other than that which is the same as Him. With all that is mentioned, evident proof of vision and insight (*kashf*) bestows that in the manifest or the interior there is nothing else but the Being of the *haqq*. Thus I do not

see with the eye or the eye of the interior anything other than the same as the *haqq* when I observe the existence outside of the intellect in the exterior and the interior. 'He is the First and the Last and the Manifest and the Hidden, and He encompasses everything.' 'God witnesses that in fact there is no other Divinity except Himself.' This is for one who fears his Lord, that he be He (and in certain copies: that he be Him). These words are the completion of the words: 'God was pleased with them and they were pleased with Him.' What has passed in between was the supposed opposition. In this, the word 'this is' points to the meaning of the words: 'God agrees to them and they agree to Him', as if meaning that the station of agreement is particular to the one who fears his Lord. In other words, the 'one who fears his Lord' is the one who differentiates the Presences of Lordship and servanthood one from the other and reflects the dues to each part. Thus the servant who is qualified by absolute servanthood establishes the degrees of agreement between the two parties and never transgresses from his servanthood by good form. The station of agreement which comes about between the two parties is particular to that servant who feared his Lord, feared of ever allowing that the Lord be his being, or that he be the being of the Lord, thus including the being of the Lord into the being of the self (*wujūd-i-'aynī*), and the rulership of the Divine Oneness be manifest upon himself and destroy differentiation, because at the level of manifestation of the rulership of the oneness differentiation and numerality becomes destroyed. 'And say: Truth has come and falsehood (*bāṭil*) is destroyed.' Thus the servant fears that he should establish unity by saying, the being of the Lord is my being or that my being is the being of the Lord, due to his knowledge of differentiation, because the servant who fears for his Lord knows the differentiation which happens between the Lord and the one who establishes Lordship. Lordship does not become realized in he who establishes Lordship, and he who establishes Lordship does not exist without the being of his Lord. However, the servant stopped at the centre of his servanthood in the state of being agreed to at the level of his Lord, and in the state of agreeing to the Lordship of his Lord because the Lord agreed to his servanthood. In the same way, the Lord is equally established in the centre of His Lordship in the

state that He is agreed to at the level of His servant, and in the state that He agrees to the servanthood of His servant because the servant agrees to His Lordship. Consequently, the Presences of Lordship and servanthood become distinguished one from the other. It is when the ignorance of some of the *a'yān* in being led us to this (differentiation), that thing which the knower brought, which means, when the ignorance of some of the *a'yān* in being pointed us to this differentiation in that thing which the knower brought, we came to know this differentiation and determined by it. For example, when some of the knowledgeable people of God expose certain things from Divine knowledges or mysteries of Lordship, some of the people being ignorant of these mysteries deny them, whereas the knowledgeable person who exposes these knows them to be true. (This interpretation is only possible when the word '*lammā*' is with the diacritical sign *tashdīd*, intensifying, but what is more likely is that this word is without *tashdīd*, in which case it would be '*limā*' and the letter *lām* becomes for assignment of a cause or reason or argumentation.) In this case it would mean that the one who fears does so because he knows the differentiation between the Lord and the servant, because the ignorance of some of the *a'yān* in existence led us to this differentiation which the knower has brought about. Indeed differentiation happened between the servants, and indeed differentiation happened between the Lords. Thus, under this consideration there is difference that came about among the servants, that is to say, between the knower and the ignorant, the difference being by virtue of the knowledge of the one and the ignorance of the other. Consequently, there came about differentiation between the Lords since the servants are the places of manifestation of the Lords. Not a servant manifests except with that which his private Lord has bestowed upon him, and his private Lord does not bestow upon him anything other than what the servant with the tongue of his aptitude of his essence asks from his Lord. Consequently, the differentiations between the servants is by what things their Lords bestow on them. However, consequently, differentiation among the servants is differentiation among the Lords. The differentiation between the Lords is through essential particularities. Thus, differentiation is first established among the Lords in the Presences of

the Names, and only then it becomes established among the servants in the Presence of Being. In short, it becomes established between the servant and the Lord as mentioned. Had there been no differentiation, then surely one Divine Name would have been interpreted in all its aspects by another, yet the Name Endearer (the One who raises in esteem) (*mu'izz*) is not interpreted by the interpretation of the Name Abaser (*mudhill*), and the rest are in the same way. If there were no differentiation between the Lords of the Divine Names, certainly one Divine Name would be interpretable in all its aspects with that with which another Name could be interpreted. However, the Name Endearer cannot be interpreted in all its aspects with the interpretation of the Name Abaser. In the same way, all the Divine Names of *mutaqābilāt* (contraries) equally cannot be interpreted this way in all their aspects, like the Beneficial (*nāfi'*) and the Misery-creator (*dārr*), and the Beautiful (*jamīl*) and the Majestic (*jalīl*). Yet it is from the aspect of Uniqueness, which means that yet Endearer is Abaser by way of Uniqueness of Ipseity and can be interpreted by the interpretation of Abaser in consideration of the Uniqueness of the Ipseity. Thus, every Name can be interpreted with the interpretation of another Name, whether it be in opposition or in concordance, because in consideration of the Uniqueness of Ipseity there is neither opposition nor concordance. Opposition and concordance are in consideration of degrees of Names. As you might say, concerning all the Names, that it leads to the Ipseity, and to its own reality by virtue of its self (its *huwiyya*), and the one who is Named is one, and the Endearer, it is the Abaser, and the Endearer is not the Abaser by virtue of its self (*nafs*) and its reality. However, you might say that each of the Divine Names leads to the Ipseity or to its own reality by virtue of its private quiddity (*huwiyya*). Thus, that which is named by all the Names is one. Consequently, in consideration of the oneness of the one Named; Endearer is the quiddity of the Abaser, yet the Endearer is not the Abaser by virtue of its own essence and its own reality, because the reality of the Endearer is distinguished from the reality of the Abaser, which means that for each Name there are two indications. One indicates the Ipseity and the other indicates the Name's own self and its reality by which it is distinguished from another

Name. At the same time, as each Name indicates the Ipseity and as the Ipseity is named by all Names, that which is named by all Names becomes one. In consideration of the oneness of that which is Named, Endearer is the same as the Abaser and can be interpreted by it. In fact, it is by this consideration that the Way of Ibn Qasiy mentioned it several times. A Name carries upon it and has posed upon it all the Names. On the other hand, as each Name indicates its own reality and its own self, the Name Endearer is not the same as the Name Abaser. Indeed the understood is different in the understanding in each one of them. Because what is understood is different in the understanding of Endearer and Abaser where it concerns each one of them, that which is understood of each one of them is the particularity of its reality, where the Ipseity, qualifying Itself by one quality, manifests Itself by it. Consequently, the qualification and manifestation of the Ipseity with the quality of Endearer is in opposition to the qualification and manifestation of God as the Abaser. If you are like that in every beginning, there is servitude in every length of the race. It can be also suitable to say, all that begins is a response to the destined opposition, as if one agreed one wins with flying colours. Then it is necessary to say, is it possible that there be a race between the Lords of perfection, especially among those who have attained to this high degree of the collectivity of totality? And he agrees by his word that every beginning is a race in every length if they are under the obligation and purpose of the race, yet in every aspect one aspect is them, their Lord.

You do not ever pass away and you do not remain.

You do not make things pass away and you do not make them persist.

This stanza is like the summing up and the result of two other lines that have gone before (which are not given here in verse form). In accordance with this, you do not pass away, because from the aspect of Reality you are the *haqq* and you will not ever pass away. Equally, you will not remain due to your creaturiality. Perhaps rather than your selfness changes at every instant in concordance with the realm it is in, like the world and the other world. God the High said: 'Rather

that they are confused by a new creation.' Equally, you do not make things pass away. That is to say, you do not make pass away absolutely the essences of being, because you know that they are the places of manifestation of God and that God is from all eternity and forever revealed and manifested in them. In the same way, you do not maintain absolutely the essences of being, because the essences of being are things that pass away and are annihilated at the level of the Uniqueness and the Last Day of Judgement and the revelation of the One and All-Conqueror. In the same way, do not make the immanence pass away from God or do not make God remain without the immanence, and in the same way, do not make the immanence pass away at the level of the revelation of God, because although the immanence is from all eternity in reality a passing away thing, yet how can you make it pass away? And equally, do not make the *haqq* persist since anyway the *haqq* persists from all eternity.

The inspiration (*wahy*) is not irradiated (*yulqā*) upon you from one to another, and you do not irradiate it.

The inspiration (*wahy*) does not descend on you from one to the other because there is no other. It is inspired into you because you are the Being of the *haqq*, and you do not pass it on to another because there is no other, because you are at the station of collectivity. All servants are the places of manifestation of your reality. Thus, they are your detailings and you are their total, and when you inspire them you do not inspire anybody else and no inspiration can be made upon you from another except from your own reality. That is to say, whatever is irradiated to you from the Lordly gifts and Divine tastes, you equally educate and irradiate this Divine knowledge to those who ask for it, and you irradiate to them only what each person's reality bestows upon them, so nothing is irradiated from another.

As the High God praised Ishmael (S.A.) with agreement and faithfulness of promise, the Shaykh (R.A.), after having explained the wisdom of the mystery of agreement, now passes on to the explanation of the wisdom of the mystery of praise (*thanā'*). The praise is through faithfulness to promise, not by faithfulness to threat, and the Divine

Presence demands essentially lauded praise. That is to say, upon the one which is praised the praise is by faithfulness of the promise, not through the faithfulness of the threat, and the Divine Presence requires the praise which is essentially lauded, which means that the Divine Presence which collects together the collectivity of the Divine Names which are the Lords of the servants, and again that Divine Presence which is the ore and the source of all goodness and perfections and the treasury of gifts and bestowals which are treasured in the treasuries of the Names by virtue of the favours and munificences which descend upon His creatures and servants demands the praise and laudation which is in itself essentially lauded, because the munificences which descend upon the servants are essentially lauded because they descend from the Presence of Holiness and Divine Nature (*lāhūr*) and from the Universe of Intimacy (*uns*) and Mercification. It is not for a special purpose or aim. Rather perhaps it is to manifest from the side of the Presence of Divinity and for revealing and for being revealed, and for acquiring from the side of the servant knowledge and worship and for arriving to the side of the Grandeur. Thus the Divine Essence requires the praise which is essentially lauded. And gives praise to It, (and in certain copies:) to the Divine Presence, by the faithfulness of the promise, not by the faithfulness of the threat, rather in fact by overlooking. 'And do not count God as one of those who will vary in His promise to His envoys.' He does not say 'the threat'. In fact He says: 'We overlook their shortcomings' with all that He had threatened in this (matter). Consequently, praise to the Divine Presence is by the faithfulness of the promise and the praising is not through the threat. Rather, the praising is by overlooking the ill-doings and crimes which necessitated the threat. God said: 'And do not count God as one of those who will vary in His promise to His envoys', and did not say: 'And do not count God as one of those who will vary in His threat to His envoys.' He rather said. 'We overlook their shortcomings', yet with all that, God the High had threatened concerning the shortcomings. That is to say, as understood from the Quranic verset, although it seemed necessary to be faithful and realize the threat, overlooking all that, He promised with the words: 'We overlook their shortcomings' the overlooking of the

shortcomings even though He had threatened. Consequently, the Divine Presence cannot be praised by faithfulness to the threat because threat is not essentially lauded and it is only in response and opposition to the shortcomings of the servant. And He praised Ishmael because he was faithful of promise, and indeed the possibility (of the realization of the threat) passed away in reality. Because Ishmael was faithful of promise God praised him, which means He praised him with the words 'faithful of promise', and because his promise maintained the persistence of the past promises. Also, in reality the possibility of the realization of the threat concerning God is eliminated, because the realization of the promise has become certain. God, with the words: 'And do not count God as one of those who will vary in His promise to His envoys', said that and praised Ishmael with the faithfulness to promise and not the faithfulness to threat. Rather, He promised with the words: 'But He will overlook', as in the quote: 'We overlook their shortcomings.' In the same way, God said: 'God covers over all shortcomings, and God does not cover up. forgive, when you associate Him with something, but after that He covers up everything', and other versets. Consequently, God's praising Ishmael by faithfulness to promise, that praise is of the category of the faithfulness of the promise of God, and by promise of overlooking it becomes established that it is necessary that the promise is carried out, and the promise is overlooking, forgiving and covering up. Consequently, from the establishment of the faithfulness of promise, the possibility of the happening of the threat became established as a possibility. When there is this in it (that is, the possibility) it is that a preference is required. In the realization of the possibility of the threat there results a demand of preference because the coming about of one of the two sides of the possibility is through preference. In this case there is nothing other than the shortcomings which would prefer the threat. Consequently, it would be necessary to demand shortcomings and the request of non-overlooking of ill-doings. But the fact is that the man is ordered with the demanding of perfections and goodnesses and beauties, and is promised with the overlooking of the ill-doings, because the only purpose of the threat is to frighten you and make one devout. Consequently, the preference of maintaining the threat over

the promise and that which necessitates the creation of distancing from the eye does not remain. On the other hand, on the side of the promise preference is always maintained. Consequently, that the faithfulness of the promise is necessary is an impossibility because were it a possibility then there would also be as a possibility the faithfulness of the threat, in which case the faithfulness of the promise would not be necessary, and it would have been necessary to praise God by the faithfulness to the threat. However, the faithfulness of the threat is not possible. That is why God is not praised by faithfulness of the threat.

**There does not remain except the (condition of being)
true to His promise, alone.**

As the possibility of the threat is eliminated there remains no other than the true to His promise, which means that the true to the threat cannot remain because by overlooking there is in existence only the faithful of promise and it is not possible to put into execution the case of the threat, because of the words: 'We did not send Our verses other than to frighten them and that they might be obedient and devout.' The envoys have not been sent to exercise the threat but only to frighten so that the people obey and are devout. Praise can only be made to the Divine Presence by the true of promise, not by the true of threat, and through the realization of the promise by the overlooking and the elimination of the possibility of the realization of the threat.

**There is not one essence which can be examined for
the case of God's threat**

because the threat concerning the rebellious people from among the believers has been eliminated by forgiveness and covering up, and for the disbelievers and coverers-up by the changing of their punishment to a munificence suitable to their states.

And when in fact they enter the house of wretchedness,

That is to say, when these people who were addressed by the verses of threat enter the house of wretchedness (hell!) due to their earning it, in fact they are:

At a taste therein which is for them a different munificence

Which means that the wretched people have a taste which is for them a different munificence, which means that they, in the house of wretchedness, are in a different munificence.

To the munificence of perpetual paradise; however, the order is one.

Which means that although the munificence is different to the munificence of the perpetual paradise, yet the order is one and the same by virtue of the revelation, which means that the happy ones and the wretched ones are under one and the same revelation, and the order of tasting and being the subject of the munificence for the people of paradise and the people of hell is the same order, which again means that the people of paradise, who are the good selves, relish their state and are in comfort, just as the people of hell, who are the wicked (*khabīth*) selves, relish wickedness and are in comfort in it. Thus, punishment becomes agreeable (*'adhb*) for them. Consequently, the order of both comforts, which is particular to each category by virtue of the character of each, is the same from the point of view of relishing.

And between the two of them there is a difference at the level of the revelation.

And it is such that although at the level of the revelation there is difference between the two comforts because of the aptitude of the place of revelation, there exists the difference between the comforts. For instance, like the water which comes from the sky, in one place it is sweet, in another place it is acrid. There is even further difference between the comforts of the two different peoples of the paradises at the level of God's revelation in the image of *rahma* because the comfort of the people of hell is from the Mercy of the Most Merciful of the Mercifuls, because it results after anger and punishment, whereas for the people of the paradise the comfort is from the Presence of the Most Merciful of the Mercifuls.

It is called punishment (*'adhāb*) because of the sweetness of its taste.

That is to say, the comfort of the people of hell is called punishment because of the sweetness of its taste. That is to say, the word *'adhāb*, 'punishment', is derived from the word *'udhūba*, 'sweetness of taste', and when the punishment is changed into comfort, punishment comes then from the sweetness of its taste. Thus, between the people of fire and of paradise in the matter of sweetness and taste the order is one.

And this is to it like the skin, and the skin protects.

That is to say, the word 'punishment' is for the punishment like a skin, yet it is true that the skin protects the kernel from catastrophes. Thus, the word 'punishment' guards the meaning of punishment from the comprehension of the people of veils who are ignorant of the reality of things. This can also mean that the comforts of the people of hell are like the skin for the comforts of the people of heaven due to the density of the comfort of the people of hell and to the subtleness of the comforts of the people of heaven, just as straw and chaff is for the donkeys and cows, and the grains for people and humans, and just as the skin protects the seed. The people of fire are burdened with the building of this world and bear the toils of it. People of paradise are places of manifestation of the building of the other world and are realized with knowledge and reality. People of fire protect the people of paradise from the forcefulness and the toil of this world and leave them at leisure for the necessities of worship. The building up of this world which is due to the unawareness of the people of veils brings about necessarily the perfection of the human places of manifestation. The rigidity of those who cover up the Truth and who make mischief is the place that carries the burden of the images of duly performing and accepting and of the kind and beautiful and virtuous. The image of *tawhīd* which manifests in the hearts of the people of oneness makes them observe the universe of Nature as similar to hell because of the particularizations and fragmentation of beauty that they observe therein, whereas the universe which includes both the heavens and the earth, which is the image of the Big Man (*insān-i-kabīr*), is with all its

parts the place of burden of the manifestation of the intimate Man and the carrier of the image of the perfection and completeness of the humankind.

Now, let it be known like this. Mercy and Compassion is an Essential Divine Quality and Anger is an accidental quality which depends on the desert of the servant's ill-doing, and the Name Avenger (*muntaqim*) equally, under whose Lordship is the one who is inflicted with Anger, is of the secondary Names. Its determination over the servant is due to the servant's offence. Consequently, if ever the servant deserves punishment and enters the house of wretchedness, which is hell, then without a doubt the consequence is that God's overreaching Mercy overreaches Anger and the punishment of the people of fire is changed into sweetness (*'adhb*), and without a doubt the punishment of the people of punishment returns to mercy after a long stretch of time. However, the munificence of this kind that the people of fire receive is in hell. That is to say, they relish the punishment, and even if a zephyr comes in from heaven they dislike it and become irritated by it, just like the dung-beetle who is used to the stench of the dung is upset with the smell of the rose.

The Shaykh (R.A.) says in his *Futūhāt* in chapter twenty: 'The emergence of the fire which torments the people, when the Divine Anger is finished for them it is joined by Compassion and Mercy which overrides it and the determination returns to it for them, but the form does not change, and had it changed it would torment them . . .'

Now, since God the High with His Names of opposition is revealed, like for instance, as the Most Indulgent (*ghaffār*) and the Destroyer (*qahhār*), as the Majestic (*jalīl*) and the Beautiful (*jamīl*), and as the Endearer (*mu'izz*) and Abaser (*mudhill*), the place of manifestation of the *jamāl* and the *jalāl* which is the paradise and hell (*jahīm*), and the mischief-makers and believers who are their Lords, who are the places of manifestation of the Names of opposition, always exist and remain. In paradise the prophets and the *muqarrabīn* who are munificized with the munificent paradises are in the witnessing of the beauty of the Lord, and at the level of the manifestation of the revelation of the Ipseity are in paradise with houris and palaces.

The totality of the levels of degrees and comprehensions which is in the hell (*jahīm*) becomes annihilated at the level of their witnessing and their vision, and they witness nothing other of the individuations or particularizations than the Absolute Face of Beauty. Consequently, that both paradise and hell, and what there is in them, pass away (*fānī*) with that special revelation does not necessitate that they do not exist at that promised time and to be passing away at the level of the Lords of this witnessing, and that at other times again at their level, and equally, at the level of those who do not witness this place of witnessing, it does not necessarily mean that it should not exist at all times. Thus, one thing can be non-existent or existent due to two different considerations. In the same way, it is not necessary for the removal altogether of the image of punishment (*'adhāb*) and the lifting up of the essence of hell because of the punishment changing into relishment, and munificence changing into vengeance according to what is mentioned of long stretches and lengthening of years for the duration of the predication of the Name Destroyer (*qahhār*), together with the hot water (*ḥamīm*) and bitter fruit (*zaqqūm*) which is the drink and the food of the degrees which are in the hell. But when the particularizations of the Names return to their origin, and when the mystery of the *nafs-i-raḥmānī* and the Divine revelation, which are fluent in the universes and in all the *ḥaḍarāt*, manifests, and the images of immanence and particularizations are lifted, then at the level of the manifestation of the difference between the Uniqueness and the Mystery of Oneness all the particularizations of relationships and beings are annihilated.

The Shaykh (R.A.) points at this mystery in the fifth chapter of his *Futūḥāt*, and says to the effect that: He is Intercessor for His own *nafs* generally and specifically, specifically in the world and generally in the other world, from the aspect that with all this He made His words: '*raḥmānī-r raḥīm* (the Most Compassionate and Merciful)' prior to His words: '*mālīki yawmi-d dīn* (Owner of the Day of Judgement)', so that the hearts of those who are veiled are familiarized and profit from the vision of the Lord of the Universes. Do you not see that the Prophet (S.A.) says: 'On the Day of Judgement the angels and the prophets intercede and the believers are interceded for, and there

remains the Most Merciful of the Compassionates', but he does not say the Compeller (*jabbār*) remains, nor the Destroyer (*qahhār*), because of the happening of the familiarization before the coming into being of the action in their hearts. For he who has known the meaning in this being, it is true for him the specialization in the station of the Most Merciful, and for he who is ignorant of it in this being, he enters with the generality into the big Day of Judgement. At the station of the *rāhimīn* is revealed the system of the rising in value of the release from liabilities and intercession, and they will see by the intercession of the Most Merciful of the Compassionates. From hell manifest the bastions to the paradise of the interior, and if the wall falls down and the fortress walls are demolished, rivers blend together and the seas welcome each other, and without the isthmus (*barzakh*) existing the punishment becomes munificence, and hell paradise, without punishment or retribution, only munificence and security in the witnessing of the evident essences, and the singing of the birds with lovely voices on the branches and round the canopied seat in the enclosure in the evening, and after those the houris and the young girl and boy servants of paradise, and the non-existence of the owner and the remaining of the agreeableness (*riḍwān*). It would so happen that hell would be munificized in the enclosures of paradise and the maleficence of the Satan would be evident to them . . .

In short, it is not far that at the level of God's complete Power and general Strength He destroys in one instant the world and the other world and what there is in them and all the particularizations of being, and brings about anew the form which is either better than the one before, or one like it. Rather, it is that at the level of the examiner heir and the verifier gnostic that God re-creates it constantly in one instant: 'Indeed they are confused by the attirement of the new creation', and God guides whom He wishes to the straight path.